60 TO 95% OF WHITE PEOPLE OPPOSE THIRD WORLD IMMIGRATION; ELITES THE EXCEPTION, NOT THE RULE; SNEAK TACTICS IN POLLS EXPOSED

By: Joël v.d. Reijden | **Date:** July 4, 2018 | **Updated:** Jan. 21, 2026 | CENTER FOR RESPONSIBLE IMMIGRATION


Army deployment necessary against asylum seekers from Africa?
Sarcastically positive
Refugees welcome
20.3%
Drown 'em all
Yes, with snipers please
71%
6,335 respondents
May 2017 poll of PowNed, a popular shock news network allowed on public TV at Nederland 3.
Increased a lot
Remain the same as it is
Reduced a lot
Increased a little
Reduced a little
Perceptions and Reality: Public Attitudes to Immigration
January 2014, Ipsos MORI: Social Research Institute

CONTENTS

1. Intro: You're not alone

2. Not all immigration is the same: the people know, elites ignore

White opposition in Europe

3. Trump's 2017 Muslim ban: 60%+ EU support; 82-86% "not disagreeing"
4. EU-US, 2011: 86%+ of whites not disagreeing with "too many immigrants" claim
5. UK, 2014: 80% of whites want immigration decrease; 3% favors increase
6. Belgium, 2011: 75% wants immigration reduction (83% of whites); 87%+ not disagreeing
7. France, 2017: "Too many immigrants": 74% agrees; 91% "doesn't disagree"
8. Netherlands, 2014: 82% opposition to more immigration; 2% support
9. Netherlands, 2026: 70% supports "remigration", 50% total immigration stop, and 83% less immigrants (for whites at least 75%+, 55%+, 88%+)
10. Sweden, 2011-2016: 55-63% of whites oppose immigration; 75%+ "doesn't disagree" with "too much" immigration

White opposition in the U.S. and Australia

11. Differences between US and EU immigration

12. Estimated 70% vocal white immigration opposition; 60% from minorities
13. Summary of U.S. polls: 70% white opposition

14. Australia: Over 52% of whites want Muslim ban anno 2017; maybe 33% opposes
15. Australians on Muslim immigration: "God help us"; government fraud with numbers?

16. Black Lives Matter: 35% support among whites, mainly women and children

Dirty tricks with polls

17. List of dirty tricks with polls used by media and polling bureaus
18. Another questionable Ipsos MORI poll
19. Questionable Pew polls - elite-controlled as well

20. Notes

Intro: No, you're not alone

Whether it involves conspiracy theory or opposition to Third World immigration, one of the key components of psychological warfare is to make people feel isolated in their beliefs. A basic example would be an insinuation, or even outright statement, as:

> *"YOU are the ONLY ONE to oppose [Third World] immigration! YOU are a HATER!"*

You and Hitler, of course.

Turn on the evening news in any European country, and most of the United States, and you can see this going on in full force: almost every single relevant headline is slanted towards keeping the borders open, helping "refugees" (over here, not in neighboring Third World countries), "unity", "love", "no fear", "dialogue", a suppression of ethnic crime numbers and racial IQ, reminding everyone again and again and again that only "bigots" and "racists" vote for "populist" candidates. It literally never ends. Social media as TikTok never fail to remind white youths of their innate colonial "racism". And to "prove" this, countless "alt right", anti-immigration social media "stars" - due to murky algorithms - all end up being Heil Hitler-greeting Nazis... Kanye West, the Tate brothers, Myron Gaines, Nick Fuentes, Sneako, etc. Half of them them aren't even white. How very odd...

However, the anti-immigration agenda is one completely devoid of scientific fact and reason - and comes down to nothing more than a

gamble if we can keep our First World society, and all its benefits, working properly in the long-run.

The ironic thing has always been that I personally don't recognize the opinions on Third World immigration pushed by politicians, superclass bankers and the mainstream media. Coming from Rotterdam in the Netherlands, a city largely wiped out culturally by black and Arab immigration, I've never heard a single white person speak positively about this type of immigration. Never. I did hear the opposite on hundreds of occasions though.

Of course, for the most part people are fearful of speaking out, often even to friends and relatives, because even an occasional sarcastic remark or joke can quickly be seen as "complaining", "cookie" and "conspiratorial", or an attack on an individual in the room. The most "positive" counter-argument one tends to hear, primarily in public situations, is, *"Well, they're not all bad"* - which of course confirms that quietly they are fully aware of the exact problem.

I actually personally used that excuse once around the year 2000 when me and a friend stepped into a tram, with him loudly remarking (he has a tendency of saying things before thinking):

> *"Jesus, look at all these blacks!"*

Obviously I observed the exact same thing as my friend (who at the same time has a number of black friends) - the demographics of citizens in this neighborhood changed extremely fast - but I felt bad for the people who didn't deserve hearing such a comment. More importantly, I was worried about a group of older black guys turning around and possibly looking for a fight.

In other words, behavior and comments like these are just a form of self-censorship. If you get attacked or even killed for speaking out, the government will just say *"We don't support violence, but we also don't condone hate-speech"* and pop out the champagne in private to celebrate the demise of one of their opponents. Hence, there is zero protection for people speaking their minds on these issues.

Alternately you might hear from friends and family: *"We know"*, so *"don't be negative"*, you *"can't change anything anyway"*, *"just move away"* to *"better"* areas and *"let it go"*. That's just the way it is with most people. They know what's going on, they know something is very wrong, but even when kept awake day and night by freshly-arrived noisy African neighbors, they just go, *"The police does nothing. The government does nothing. What am I gonna do?"* If they have the money, they move away from immigration centers. That's about all they do. They don't organize.

They don't protest. They just try to get away. It's called "white flight" - a controversial, but extremely accurate term.

However, one thing is certain: support for Third World immigration among native white people sits at VERY low levels. Politicians, bankers and media outlets are the outliers; not us. They are causing the negativity; not us. They are the problem; we are the solution. These politicians, bankers and media outlets may have all the power, but very few people actually support the narrative they put out. People just shut up and go along.

Don't take my word for it though. Let's take a look at some of the available statistics and in the process become a little bit more "empowered".

Not all immigration is the same: the people know, elites ignore

One prominent aspect of Third World immigration propaganda, especially in the United States, is to purposely confuse First World immigration with Third World immigration, for example from Scotland to the United States. Everybody knows that you can't compare native Scots to Nigerian blacks or Moroccan Arabs. Scots share western cultural values with the United States, with whites from these regions having roughly comparable crime and IQ numbers. This is completely different with Arabs and Africans. The mainstream media and politicians never seem to get this, but the people know. Here is a statistic of the European Social Survey 7 of 2014, counting 40,000 respondents in 21 European countries, plus Israel, that shows just how aware people are of that:

Figure 2: Attitudes towards different sorts of migrant in 2014



Source: European Social Survey Round 7, 2014 (all participating countries)
Analysis was conducted on the full sample of ESS respondents. Both design and population weights applied. Results exclude DK and refusal responses.

Clearly inter-western immigrants and Jews are much more welcome than Third World immigrants as Muslims. When you look at "allow many" and "allow some", there is - with a minor, to-be-discussed correction - about 75% support for "same race or ethnic group" and only 30% support for Muslims. That spells out, in just one oversight, that not all "immigrants" are perceived the same. As we shall see, most polls simply are based on opposition to "immigrants", one of countless (convenient for the establishment) flaws in polls conducted that we will explore in this article.

There are also various problems with this European Social Survey poll, primarily that it is not based on whites, but includes an ever-growing number of black, Muslim, Eastern European and other immigrants whose views, realistically, should be discounted. Who cares that a West-European country has 6% (problematic) Muslims who vote "allow many" for Muslims, "allow none" for Jews and on top of that hate gays and women's rights? Clearly an ethnic group like this needs to be listed separately.

Another issue is that the description *"poorer countries outside Europe"* is not specified. Are we talking about Vietnam and Thailand or about Sub-Saharan Africa? Or maybe what's in between: Latin America? The poll should have been much more specific here.

Also the categories to vote on in this poll are much too vague. "Allow few" leads one to think of a few dozen, "allow some" maybe a few thousand, and "allow many" sounds like there should be no upper limit. The poll makers should have been more specific here. I personally could vote "allow some" for almost any category of immigrants, even though I'm vastly more opposed to Third World immigration and Gypsies than I am to fellow-Westerners and Jews. "Some" is the key to keeping our society functioning.

An additional poll of the European Social Survey, this time from 2011, reveals that Westerners aren't particularly racist when it comes to skin color or religion. Support for immigration among whites skyrockets when immigrants involve "professionals" "filling jobs" or even "searching for work". Support for Eastern European whites still is preferred over Muslims, but the differences are quite small. However, when immigrants involve "unskilled laborers", support for them among native whites collapses hugely, to the point of 80% opposition - and that is still with about 6% blacks and Muslims included in the poll. Below is the poll for Muslims:


About 6% Muslim and black immigrants participated in this poll.
Very bad for Britain
Bad for Britain
Neither good nor bad for Britain
Good for Britain
Very good for Britain
Filling jobs
Searching for work
Filling jobs
Searching for work
Professionals
Unskilled Labourers
MIGRANTS FROM MUSLIM COUNTRIES LIKE PAKISTAN
2011, European Social Survey, as discussed in: 2014, Ipsos MORI, Perceptions and reality: Public attitudes to Immigration, p. 41.

Obviously, with "professionals" most people are thinking of corporate CEOs going to work for a variety of multinationals. But basically everything comes down not to "work or no work", but to the extent that immigrants are able to blend in with western society in terms of IQ, crime numbers, secularism or Christianity, and general culture. That chance clearly is much higher with educated professionals than the low-educated Third World immigrants masses.

Also, most ordinary citizens recognize there are healthy limits to the number of immigrants that are able to come over. What is clear from the above two polls is that immigration opposition primarily stems from the fact that far too many unsophisticated, crime-ridden immigrant groups are coming over who as a whole can be labeled as "unskilled". Opposition has relatively little to do with simply skin color or "a fear of the unknown" or "what's different" - as the media and Soros propaganda machines are trying to tell us. It's about practical issues as culture, crime, IQ and numbers.

POLLS FOR EUROPE

Trump's 2017 Muslim ban: 60%+ EU support; 82-86% "not disagreeing"

Days after his January 20, 2017 inauguration, Trump wrote an executive order greatly restricting Muslim immigration into the country. It's very unfortunate that he caused an unnecessary humanitarian crisis at airports by holding Muslims there, but that's what "populists" tend to do: undermine themselves. The important thing here is that "liberal CIA"-funded support and protest groups, bought Hollywood stars and musicians, politicians and almost the entire international media portrayed Trump's action as *"insane"*, *"inhumane"*, *"racist"*, *"bigoted"*,

"fear-based", *"Islamophobic"* and what not. As usual, there has been no room whatsoever for statistical data or a reasonable debate.

Luckily, Chatham House, a very elite think tank alternately known as the Royal Institute for International Affairs, already was in the process of conducting a Europe-wide poll on sentiment against Third World immigration, mainly from Muslim countries. They asked residents of 10 European countries the question if *"ALL further migration from mainly Muslim countries should be stopped"*. The question posed is rather extreme: *"ALL migration"* is a very drastic measure (the European Social Survey above, for example, allowed for "allow a few" and "allow some"), more severe even than Trump dared to suggest. However, apparently not the most "in touch" researchers, they were very surprised about the results:

> *"Our results suggest ... that public opposition to any further migration from predominantly Muslim states is by no means confined to Trump's electorate in the US but is fairly widespread. ... An average of 55 per cent of people across the 10 European countries surveyed wanted to stop ALL future immigration from mainly Muslim countries."*[1]



A 55% average might sound reasonably impressive, but it's still an understatement. Why? For starters, and as we shall soon see, the immigration opposition in this study for the countries Italy and Great Britain are unusually low - and the same seems to go for Spain. Other polls reveal numbers 10-20% higher, even from years back, before the 2014-2017 immigration crisis. More importantly, virtually all polls like this are conducted in a "fair" and "inclusive" manner, meaning that they sneak in the relative immigrant populations for each country. If we compensate for that by just moving the Muslim vote from "disagree" (with a halt to Muslim immigration) to "agree", we find that the differences between western and eastern Europe become very small, and in some cases completely disappear. The average "agree" vote moves from 55 to 60%, with the percentages for eastern Europe basically untouched, because the countries in question have no significant Muslim populations. Instead of 82% of EU citizens *"not [really] disagreeing"* with

banning virtually all Third World immigration - already a huge number - now it stands at 86%.


'All further migration from mainly Muslim countries should be stopped'
Source: Chatham House, https://www.chathamhouse.org/expert/comment/what-do-europeans-think-about-muslim-immigration
Royal Institute of International Affairs
Percent
Total 86% 60% 55%
Belgium 92% 71% 64%
Germany 88% 60% 53%
Greece 86% 64% 58%
Spain 71% 45% 41%
France 91% 69% 61%
Italy 80% 54% 51%
Austria 90% 72% 65%
UK 84% 54% 48%
Hungary 89% 64%
Poland 90% 70%
60% agrees; 85%"doesn't disagree"
Agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Disagree
Approximate Muslim population and dominant group in Jan. 2017:
- Belgium: 7% (Moroccans);
- Germany: 6.5% (Turks);
- Greece: 5.5% (Albanians);
- Spain: 4.2% (Moroccans);
- France: 8.2% (all of NW Africa);
- Italy: 3% (Moroccans);
- Austria: 7% (Turks);
- UK: 6.2% (Pakistanis);
- Hungary: 0.2%
- Poland: 0.1%
With Muslim segment removed from poll
Note: Spain, Italy and the UK score much higher in other studies.
ISGP-studies.com '18

If we consider the low scores for Spain, Italy and the UK to be anomalies - which they are - and, based on other polls, add a very minor 10% for Spain and a very reasonable 10% for Italy and 20% for Great Britain to "agree" instead of "neither agree nor disagree" (see the next section for these scores) and we're talking average EU-wide "agree" numbers for native whites to ban almost all Third World immigration of 65%, 10% higher than what Chatham House reported. At that point native whites not outspokenly "disagreeing" with banning virtually all Third World immigration possibly moves up from 86% to 90% - 9 out of every 10 whites. But who is counting at that point? Even in Chatham House's original poll, close to 82% of EU citizens they polled didn't explicitly oppose what politicians and the media have been denouncing as one of the most horrendously racist measures ever.


trumpcamp
A Trumpcamp is an unconstitutional internment camp created by then-standing president Donald Trump where undocumented immigrants are stripped from the families and abused. May also be called a Trump Camp.
Years from now Trumpcamps will be listed in the section next to the Trail of Tears, Japanese Internment, and Jim Crow laws. Hopefully next to the article on impeachment.
by [Sic] of this shit July 01, 2018
423
860

Another example that the masses are not exactly anti-Trump: On July 1, 2018 someone created a new propagandist word on the youth-dominated UrbanDictionary.com: "Trumpcamp", based on a recent elite-created controversy surrounding children being separated from their illegally immigrated parents. Guess what: 67%, or two out of every three, disliked the entry over the next few days. One wonders what the demographics of this "poll" were.

Obviously the Chatham House researchers came up with all the usual excuses why these numbers are so high: old, uneducated, unsuccessful, suburban and rural people are to blame, as are misconceptions about the

number of immigrants, and *"radical right"* politicians spreading *"fear"* about the Muslim religion. We can counter that to a large extent, but the fact remains that opposition to Third World immigration is orders of magnitude greater than what the establishment wants us to think. They want us to believe that we are all isolated and alone in our *"bigotry"*, but it's the establishment, the media they own, the politicians they control, and the antifa protest groups they finance that are part of a small, extremist, irrational, hateful, manipulative minority. And there are more statistics to back up this claim.

EU-US, 2011: 86%+ of whites not disagreeing with "too many immigrants" claim

One of the more insightful (and relatively visible) polls on opposition to Third World immigration among the masses of Europe and North America dates back to 2011, three years before the so-called "immigration crisis" started. It was conducted by the Social Research Institute Ipsos MORI, a British statistical research firm that, as might be expected, has a major bias towards the liberal superclass. Its managing director and head of research, Bobby Duffy, is a contributor to "new left" and thus extremely pro-Third World immigration Guardian newspaper. Despite that, it is hard to deny statistical data: as it turns out, most people in the EU and US are raging bigots, according to Ipsos MORI's own data. Excluding Canada and Mexico, an average of 61% of citizens in these regions thought *"there are too many immigrants in our country"*. Well, 64% is the real minimum average, but that will be discussed in a minute. Anyway... Oh my God, what?!


"There are too many immigrants in our country"
% Strongly/Tend to agree
EU: only 16-64 included! US: 18-64! (+3% compensation)
Belgium 4% 8% 11% disagrees 72% 75% 83%
UK 6% 9% 12% disagrees 71% 74% 80%
Italy 11% 13% 16% disagrees 67% 70% 72%
Spain 6% 8% 11% disagrees 67% 70% 75%
US 8% 11% 14% disagrees 59% 62% 67%*
Germany 14% 17% 20% disagrees 53% 56% 61%
France 13% 17% 20% disagrees 52% 55% 63%
Sweden 27% 30% 33% disagrees 46% 49% 54%
Canada 22% 26% 29% disagrees 42% 45% 53%
Mexico 13% 14% 17% disagrees 37% 40% 41%
*Different method: U.S. white opposition known to sit ±11% above minorities.
Ipsos
Remaining %: People who didn't agree nor disagree.
Q. "Please tell me whether you agree or disagree with each of the following statements"
Global @dvisor
© 2011 Ipsos
Red percentage: Arab and black population excluded in EU. Only 50% with disagrees.
Edits by ISGP-studies.com '18
Like most polls, this one (silently) INCLUDES IMMIGRANT VOTERS relative to the country's percentage. Also: Only 16/18-64 years of age, EXCLUDING SENIORS, a group that heavily votes against Third World immigration!
EU Arab + black immigrant numbers for 2011, plus main immigration group: Belgium: 8% (Moroccans), UK: 6%, (Pakistanis), Italy: 1.5% (Moroccans, Egyptians), Spain: 4.5% (Moroccans), Germany: 5% (Turks), France: 8% (NW Africa), Sweden: 4.5% (Syrians, Iraqis). East Europeans not included.
North America: Mexico: 1% (0.003% Muslim + 1% black), Canada: 7.5% (6% Arab and black from all over) + 1.5% hispanic), US: 27% (0.5% Arab + 11% black + 15.5% hispanic).
The extremely important "disagree" numbers come from the raw poll data. They were not discussed by Ipsos MORI.

Sweden, with its rather small population, is included, bringing the average down with 2 percent points. Since the latest crisis and new waves of immigrants streaming in - such as the North African Somalis and Moroccans - opinion has been shifting here too in recent years. Most

of it seems to be related to politically correct thinking. The same seems to go for Canada. This country is only included (many Second and Third World countries were cut out) for future reference. Mexico is only included here to make the point that lower levels of opposition to immigration have little to do with being *"less bigoted"* - unless Mexico is a beacon of multicultural open-mindedness I'm not aware of...

This time around, France scores a little on the low end. On the other hand, the countries Spain, Italy and Great Britain all reveal much higher levels of opposition to immigration than can be seen in the January 2017 poll of Chatham House. As we shall see for Great Britain, this higher number is much more realistic. The same goes for Italy, where in March 2018 the "populist" parties Five Star Movement and League Party (Northern League) were voted into office, fully due to massive discontent over Arab and African immigration. Spain has seen an 800 percent increase in Islamic immigration in the 2000-2013 period, causing plenty of friction. Unfortunately, not a lot of poll data is available on Spain. It certainly is an economically underdeveloped country, making right-wing populism rather unpopular here.

The reason that 64% instead of 61% - with Spain, Italy, Great Britain and Belgium all scoring in the 70-75% range for Third World immigration opposition - is a much more likely average is because Ipsos MORI simply decided to exclude anyone of 65 and older from their poll! I actually didn't pick up on this for the longest time. It was only after a remark of Bobby Duffy in private conversation, that I looked a little closer at the fine print. And indeed:

> *"For the results of the survey presented herein, an international sample of 18,607 adults age 18-64 in the US and Canada, and age 16-64 in all other countries, were interviewed."*[2]

Incredible. In other words: your parents and grandparents - who generally are among the more opposed to immigration according to many other international polls - may still vote on political candidates for a few more decades, but Ipsos MORI considers their opinions worthless. To make the situation even more obviously biased, for Europe, Ipsos MORI polled children of 16 and 17, once again knowing full well that younger age groups vote in larger numbers for open borders. Children of this age aren't even allowed to vote and can legally be censored by their parents, not too mention that high school kids still are very dependent for their opinions on "authorities" within society, including their teachers at school. The obvious arguments Ipsos MORI could drum up would be that young people "are the future". This would be a questionable argument at best, because at the same time one could make the case that these children might get "older", "wiser" and more resistant to pressure from authorities - and as a result might slowly start to change their opinion

towards an anti-immigration one. Nobody can say for sure which scenario will turn out to be accurate, and to what extent, so there is absolutely no reason to exclude elders from a poll on immigration except to skewer the results in favor of open borders.

Another aspect VERY important to discuss with this 2011 poll is that, as usual, the immigrant population has been (quietly) included. This has always been something that I worried/wondered about when running into polls on immigration. Reading the following in the fine print of the Ipsos MORI poll only made me more suspicious: *"Weighting was then employed to balance demographics [so it] reflects that of the adult population..."* Just to be sure, I asked study leader Bobby Duffy about it. His reply:

> *"Thank you for your query on whether immigrants are included in the poll you refer to – yes they are, and usually are in these sorts of polls, because they are designed to be representative of the resident population."*

Thus, as the reader can see, ISGP has included a few additions and corrections to this poll. First a modest 3% increase to immigration opposition to represent the graying white masses of the West (this correction is even more modest with 16 and 17-year-old children involved), followed by a removal of the Muslim and African black population share of the population/poll (not the full extent of immigrants, just the most problematic). All of a sudden average opposition to immigration in the EU increases from 61% to 64% - and then on to 70% with Muslims and blacks removed. That's quite a difference and much more reflective of the white population.


"There are too many immigrants in our country"
% Strongly/Tend to agree
EU: only 16-64 included! US: 18-64! (+3% compensation)
Belgium 4% 8% 11% disagrees 72% 75% 83%
UK 6% 9% 12% disagrees 71% 74% 80%
Italy 11% 13% 16% disagrees 67% 70% 72%
Spain 6% 8% 11% disagrees 67% 70% 75%
US 8% 11% 14% disagrees 59% 62% 67%*
Germany 14% 17% 20% disagrees 53% 56% 61%
France 13% 17% 20% disagrees 52% 55% 63%
Sweden 27% 30% 33% disagrees 46% 49% 54%
Canada 22% 26% 29% disagrees 42% 45% 53%
Mexico 13% 14% 17% disagrees 37% 40% 41%
*Different method: U.S. white opposition known to sit ±11% above minorities.
Ipsos
Remaining %: People who didn't agree nor disagree.
Q. "Please tell me whether you agree or disagree with each of the following statements"
Global @dvisor
© 2011 Ipsos
Red percentage: Arab and black population excluded in EU. Only 50% with disagrees.
Edits by ISGP-studies.com '18
Like most polls, this one (silently) INCLUDES IMMIGRANT VOTERS relative to the country's percentage. Also: Only 16/18-64 years of age, EXCLUDING SENIORS, a group that heavily votes against Third World immigration!
EU Arab + black immigrant numbers for 2011, plus main immigration group: Belgium: 8% (Moroccans), UK: 6%, (Pakistanis), Italy: 1.5% (Moroccans, Egyptians), Spain: 4.5% (Moroccans), Germany: 5% (Turks), France: 8% (NW Africa), Sweden: 4.5% (Syrians, Iraqis). East Europeans not included.
North America: Mexico: 1% (0.003% Muslim + 1% black), Canada: 7.5% (6% Arab and black from all over) + 1.5% hispanic), US: 27% (0.5% Arab + 11% black + 15.5% hispanic).
The extremely important "disagree" numbers come from the raw poll data. They were not discussed by Ipsos MORI.

At the same time, average outspoken disagreement with the idea that there are *"too many immigrants"* goes down from 18% to 15% and then to just below 12%. In this case only half of the immigration population was

subtracted, because these groups also tend to oppose additional immigration to some extent. This certainly includes U.S. minorities (include the full percentage and support drops to an impossibly low -2%, quite different from EU countries), but we are not discussing those here. Clearly some of the minorities too can see that the social fabric in the West is breaking down. It is surmised here that quite a few immigrants actually can be found in the rather large and undiscussed *"neither agree nor disagree"* category. As we shall see, 11% outspoken support for increased Third World immigration can be a bit of a high percentage among Europeans.

There might be an additional issue with this Ipsos MORI poll, namely that poll participates partake through its vague "Ipsos Online Panel system". I asked Bobby Duffy about it, but for the time being he has not replied on it, apart from explaining that it is a different method of polling than most other international polls. Concerns this author has is that the older people get and the lower educated they are, the harder it is for them to work with computers. Additional concerns are how participants are selected and how it might deal with employees of "liberal CIA" foundation-funded pro-immigration institutes from signing up for this panel.

In any case, while these Ipsos MORI practices should be considered scandalous, in the end the results are not dissimilar to the January 2017 poll on anti-Muslim sentiment of Chatham House. Add a few percent for the missing senior citizens (and inclusion of children), add a little more to cancel out included Third World immigrant votes, and for most of Europe the 2011 Ipsos MORI poll easily reveals 60 to 83% agreement with the notion *"There are too many immigrants in our country"*. While most people would have this demographic in mind, we haven't even singled out Muslims here yet. Banning every last Muslim, as the 2017 Chatham House poll proposed, is too much of a sweeping statement and doesn't really result in higher agreement numbers, but we can easily add a few more percent in case of a moderate question as *"Are there too many immigrants from the Middle East (and/or Africa) here?"* One wonders why Ipsos MORI and so other sources for polls don't ask this specific question...

UK whites in 2014: 80% wants immigration decrease; 3% favors increase

One of the first questions I asked Ipsos MORI managing director and study leader Bobby Duffy why his research institute wasn't putting out immigration polls per significant ethnicity that is residing in a particular country. After all, it would be nice to know what West-European and U.S. whites, East-European whites, Arabs, blacks, Hispanics and North East

Asians think about every other type of immigration. After breaking down polls in this matter, it's always possible to also include a "demographically responsible" total average. Or am I being illogical here?

Duffy didn't really get into the question, but was kind enough to point me to a 2014 study that actually very extensively polled Britain's white population for its support or opposition to increased numbers of (Third World) immigration. The results? Ipsos MORI polled an average (outspoken) opposition of no less than 79.7%! That literally is the exact same number - 80% - as I estimated for Britain's white population in the 2011 poll above - accomplished by excluding the Third World immigrant vote and adding 3% more as a minimal compensation for the exclusion of all senior citizens above the age 64 (64+ looks to be included in this 2014 poll on whites; there's no disclaimer and here and there in the report a 64+ category exists). I may not know much about popular opinion in the United States with regard to Latinos in particular (people are very subdued about the issue), but I do know European sentiment regarding Arab and African black immigration.


Figure 1.18: Attitudes on the level of immigration among White British people born in the UK, by twelve clusters created from Home Office cluster analysis
Most international immigration polls (silently) include the immigrant vote in proportion to their national makeup.
Do you think the number of immigrants coming to Britain nowadays should be increased a lot, increased a little, remain the same as it is, reduced a little, or reduced a lot?
Increase vote:
Reduce vote (average of 79.7%)
6% 26 68% 34 34 Cosmopolitan London and Periphery
3% 26 71% 33 38 Superdiverse London
4% 25 71% 24 47 High Turnover Provincial and Student Towns
1% 21 78% 25 53 London Suburbs and Satellite Towns
2% 18 80% 25 55 Prosperous Small Towns
1% 15 84% 25 59 Rural and Coastal Retirement Towns
2% 16 82% 22 60 Diverse Conurbation Centres
1% 14 85% 24 61 New, Large Freestanding and Commuter Towns
2% 13 85% 23 62 Migrant Worker Towns and Countryside
1% 14 85% 22 63 Low Migration Small Towns and Rural Areas
2% 14 84% 20 64 Industrial and Manufacturing Towns
2% 15 83% 16 67 Asylum Dispersal Areas
Increased a lot
Increased a little
Remain the same as it is
Reduced a little
Reduced a lot
Perceptions and Reality: Public Attitudes to Immigration
January 2014, Ipsos MORI: Social Research Institute

What else is there really to say about these numbers? Anyone still wondering why Britons voted for Brexit in 2016? It is purely because of extreme discontent over Third World immigration into the country. The European Union gives member countries almost no control over their borders, so the only way is to get out altogether. It's a very unfortunate development, but what choice do people have?

Biased as it is towards the liberal superclass, the overwhelming majority of this Ipsos MORI report consists of similar reasoning as the Chatham House one - and basically most other immigration poll reports. Included as well are many largely irrelevant charts trying to paint Britons as the most bigoted people on the planet. How about comparing historical British opposition to immigration of 55 to 75% to a "global average" of

just 10%? There are many more examples, some of them based on rather questionable polls. For example, 29% of "British" people versus 46% of "Dutch" people looking at immigration as *"more of an opportunity"* than *"more of a burden"*, respectively opposed by 64% of Britons (an overwhelming majority) and 41% of the Dutch (a minority)? How about Ipsos MORI researchers start by taking out the 23% immigrant population in the Netherlands, versus about 15% for Great Britain? That already closes the gap a bit. But even then, being from the Netherlands, it's hard to conceive that those saying immigration is *"more of an opportunity"* weren't just trying to be politically correct, making a hypothetical point, or exclusively thinking about Chinatown. We'll get to the Netherlands later on in this article.

Along similar lines it is argued in the 2014 Ipsos MORI report that white people in *"more diverse"* neighborhoods are *"better at coping with change"*. It's ignored that even in these neighborhoods outspoken support for increased immigration only grows by 1 or 2% - so apparently Third World immigration is not considered paradise. The fact that opposition to immigration goes down among remaining whites in inner cities can be ascribed to a number of reasons not discussed by Ipsos MORI, such as to not be "disloyal" to friends and family or because a lot of businessmen - who don't like labor shortages - continue to reside in the better neighborhoods of big cities, especially Central London (known as the "City of London"). The fact remains, virtually every white person who has the money, flees the inner cities to raise their children in the suburbs, or even farther away from immigration centers.

Belgium, 2011: 75% wants immigration reduction (83% of whites); 87%+ not disagreeing

The previously-discussed 2011 study of Ipsos MORI polled 72% opposition to immigration by Belgians. With senior citizens included that became an estimated 75%. With the black and Arab population subsequently removed, estimated opposition rose to 83% (this method was just confirmed to work extremely well in case of Great Britain). The 2017 Chatham House study polled support for banning basically ALL Muslim/Third World immigration into Belgium at 64%. With the Muslim population removed from the poll, outspoken support rose to 71%, with an enormous 92% "not disagreeing".

If we look at another immigration poll in Belgium, this one published in January 2017 by the mainstream Le Soir and RTBF media outlets, we find roughly similar numbers. 5,134 people were polled, 400 of which were Muslim, a percentage of 7.8%, comparable to Belgian demographics at the time. There's a good chance that the remaining portion included non-

Muslim blacks and eastern Europeans, but we'll let that slide. We have no information on that either way.

The poll creators asked citizens to agree or disagree with the statements *"There are too many immigrants in our society"* and *"We are being invaded more and more [by] refugees [and] immigrants"*. 67% - two out of three - agreed with the first notion, with 79% not opposing. Take out the 7.8% Muslim immigrant vote and 75% - three out of four - agreed and 87% - close to one in ten - didn't disagree with the statement that there are too many immigrants in Belgium. The second notion resulted in roughly similar percentages. These numbers are quite on par with what we saw in the earlier 2011 and 2017 studies.



There also was the statement that *"immigrants are rather a menace to our society"*. Despite this rather confrontational remark, 60% of participants agreed, a number that goes up to 68% - a solid two out of three - if the Muslim percentage is removed/added.

We can only wonder how high these numbers would have been if only native white Belgians were polled and better questions were asked. Clearly this mainstream media poll was meant to produce the lowest possible support numbers against Third World immigration. The statements are very much on the harsh side, they could have made better distinction between types of immigrants, and the listing of results by age also is a little problematic because immigrants are overrepresented in the lower age brackets. Then, to finish things up, the newspapers drew this wonderful conclusion:

> *"The results are confronting: they point to a society inhabited by fear and the rejection of otherness. In other words, more and more xenophobic."*[3]

Such a conclusion of seemingly irrational fear is not particularly productive. Opposition to immigration has developed because of crime numbers and cultural unsophistication among Arab and black immigrant

groups in particular, especially among the large numbers of Moroccans the Belgian state has allowed to come in. The rest is all nonsense. Well, people like their own tribe. But they have that right, at least to a large extent.

France, 2017: "Too many immigrants": 74% agrees; 91% "doesn't disagree"

In the earlier-listed 2011 Ipsos MORI poll, opposition to immigration in France was quite low compared to many other European countries: just 52%. That became a respectable 60% when the Muslim and black vote was removed from the poll. It's a solid majority, but maybe not what one would expect when looking at the severity of the immigration problem in France.

In the 2017 poll of Chatham House, outspoken opposition to Muslim/Third World immigration among the French stood at 61%, although in reality, with the Muslim vote excluded, 69% is a more accurate number for the white population. In that same poll, 91% of French citizens did not fully disagree with the notion that *"ALL further migration from mainly Muslim countries should be stopped"*.

Several additional polls have been conducted in France about immigration. In 2013 - just two years after the Ipsos MORI study - Le Monde carried out such a poll and found that no less than 70% of the population thought too many foreigners were living in France. In addition, 74% of poll takers didn't believe that Islam is compatible with western culture, and 57% thought that racism against native white people by immigrants was common. Maybe most shockingly, 62% of poll participants reported not to feel at home anymore in France. [4]

There are some issues with this poll though. Once again it includes the immigrant population. Just the fact that a whopping 29% of poll participants stated that immigrants are *"well-integrated"* into France is clear proof of that. If you exclude all foreign territory owned by France, in 2014 roughly a solid 8% of France consisted of Arabs and African blacks. That brings this number down to about 21%. That's still sounds rather high for a poll only involving native whites, but it looks to be considerably more accurate.

If we take this same 8% Arab and African blacks, then not 70%, but more like 78% of French native whites citizens were of the opinion in 2013 that there are too many foreigners. Exclude the Muslims (the exact number is undocumented) and about 80% of native French people think that the Islam is not compatible with western culture. In similar fashion, about 65% of French people thought that racism against native whites is common France - something that would occasionally be experienced by

Frenchmen who lives close to major Third World immigration centers (this author has experienced it too in the Netherlands).

The 62% number for French people not feeling at home anymore in their country is misleading in a different way, because this goes for both native whites *and* foreigners - and for opposing reasons. It's more likely that about 40% of French people don't feel at home anymore in their own country, primarily persons living in or close to major immigration areas. Still, when you are in charge of a country in which the vast majority of people don't feel like they belong anymore, then maybe that should inspire some drastic changes.

In March 2017, just one month after the publication of the Europe-wide Chatham House poll, Le Monde also carried out a poll among the French population:



"65% of people believe that "there are too many foreigners in France", according to our survey "French Fractures 2017". ... In almost identical proportions, 60% of French people say that "today, we do not feel at home as before". Finally, 61% of respondents believe that, "in general, immigrants do not make an efforts to integrate in France"...

The tension with regard to immigration is indeed very strong: 65% of the French believe that "there are too many foreigners in France" , a level identical to 2016 and virtually constant since 2014. About this point at least, the cleavage between right and left remains relevant: if 95% of sympathizers of the National Front share this opinion, they are almost as many among those of the Republican Party (83%, + 7 points in one year). Conversely, this judgment is a minority among supporters of [the left-wing] La France Insoumise (30%), the [Socialist Party] PS (46%) and [Macron's socialist-liberal] En Marche! (46%).

"Similarly, social divisions remain a clear discriminant: 77% of workers believe that there are too many foreigners in France,

> *against 66% of [non-manual work] employees, 57% of persons in intermediate professions and 46% of executives."*[5]

Removing about 9% problematic Arab and black Africans from the poll (their respective shares rise rapidly) leads to not 65%, but instead 74% of predominately white French citizens thinking there are too many immigrants, with 70% saying they are not making enough of an effort to integrate. We would probably see even higher numbers of opposition once only native white French are polled and Arab and African immigrants are singled out as the primary issue - not "immigrants" as a whole.

The makers of this last poll once again asked some incredibly questionable (or incompetent) questions. How about: *"Is it difficult for an immigrant to integrate?"* 54% voted "yes", 465 voted "no". How should a question like this be interpreted? Is it difficult to integrate because "they" are Muslim? Or because "you" are a Muslim? Or because of racism by the French? Or because of laziness or nationalism on the part of immigrants? Or maybe because of a lack of social services? It almost seems as if Le Monde asked this question to evoke sympathy for immigrants, knowing that many people from all sides would probably vote "yes". I admit, that's a conspiracy theory.

Here's a summary of the four discussed French polls of the 2011-2017 period on mainly stopping Third World immigration, with the Muslim and black populations filtered out:

- 2011: 60% agrees.
- 2013: 78% agrees.
- Feb. 2017: 69% agrees. 91% doesn't fully disagree.
- Mar. 2017: 74% agrees.

The average number here is 70% opposition to Third World immigration from primarily native white French citizens. If we exclude the oldest number from 2011 (IPSOS also is the most questionable), the average is 74%, which certainly today is probably the more realistic number. However, another 15% or so of French citizens clearly are flirting with the idea of voting to stop immigration. These numbers are very similar to what we see in other countries, certainly once the immigrant population is excluded from polls.

Netherlands, 2014: 82% opposition to more immigration

In 2014 the Dutch branch of the earlier-discussed British research institute Ipsos MORI was kind enough to do a poll on immigration sentiment in the Netherlands. The results were reported by popular (then) Bilderberg-owned news aggregate website Nu.nl:

> *"A majority of the Dutch is of the opinion that the number of foreign inhabitants is too high. That is revealed in a poll of Ipsos among 1,136 Dutch of 18 years and older. Of them 55 percent checked off "too high"... More than a quarter thinks this percentage is "just right" and 2 percent "too low"."*[6]

Looking at the original study, we find that 27% voted "just right", effectively meaning that 82% of poll participants opinioned that the Netherlands doesn't need any additional immigration, with 2% - which includes the government and the media - saying we need more immigrants. That's a pretty devastating poll and quite in line with others in Europe and the United States.

One thing to always keep in mind is that a lot of people are uncomfortable saying there are too many immigrants and will choose to be politically correct and "non-populist" by saying there are "just enough" immigrants - *but* maybe "no more" should be coming here. Of course, these people said the same thing 10 years ago and will say the same thing 10 years from now. This is important to keep in mind, because politicians will undoubtedly spin the truth by claiming that only a small majority (55%) claims that immigration is too high while ignoring the fact that 27.5x more people said that the number of immigrants is too high vs too low. If the middle ground gets removed with people not having to worry about political intimidation, it's clear that somewhere 85%+ is going to vote "too high".


Ipsos MORI Netherlands
2014 "are there too many immigrants?" poll
Poll should include immigrant population of 21%, 9% of which blacks and Arabs. No info provided.
Own neighborhood
(useless)
National
(useful)
Is het aantal mensen dat van buitenlandse afkomst is, naar uw idee, te hoog, te laag of precies goed in uw eigen woonomgeving/Nederland?
Too high / Te hoog: 24% (i.e., send back)
Just right / Precies goed: 59% (i.e., stop)
Too low / Te laag: 6% (i.e., allow more)
55%
27%
82%: stop!
2%
16% no opinion?

One thing that is an issue with this poll is that there is no indication that foreigners were removed from it. Back in 2014 21% of Dutch people had an immigrant background (3-4 years later already over 23%), roughly 9% consisting of blacks and Arabs. Considering only 2% in this poll said there were not enough immigrants, and even when looking in the "own neighborhood" no more than 6% said "too few", it's impossible to say for certain what is going on here. 16% of participants apparently voted "no opinion", because this group is missing from the statistics. We need more information here.

Despite the widespread support for reducing immigration, this Ipsos poll still basically constitutes one dirty trick. After reporting what people think of the national number of immigrants (generally too high), they start making the case that 57% of people overestimate the number of immigrants in the country. Then they ask everyone what they think of immigration levels in their own neighborhood, where 59% says it's "just

right", 24% says too high and only 6% says it's "too low". With "just right" many Dutch people are really saying, *"Awesome, because there are none. Or almost none."* Similarly, Moroccans living in a predominantly Moroccan neighborhood might also be very happy voting "just right". It's just a silly question - and more such questions were included in the Ipsos poll.

Unless the leadership is extremely incompetent, the case that Ipsos clearly was trying to make with their study is that native whites are delusional about the immigration problem - that it's all in their heads - because, *"Look, you've been overestimating the number of immigrants and in your own neighborhood it's all not so bad. See? And that's the only place you can observe with your own two eyes? Right? So maybe (Third World) immigration is not so bad as you think?"* It's all psychological warfare, similar to what other polling institutes and the media are doing. It's just about giving politicians and the media excuses to not act, or make people doubt their own observations.

Because of these issue with this Dutch Ipsos MORI poll, it's very hard to image Ipsos having polled just native whites here. Most likely a lot of foreigners are contained in the missing 16% "no opinion" section, with many migrants not wanting any fast or significant increases in immigration, because it will just lead to a "populist" backlash and the scrapping of social security and other liberal-socialist benefits.


Army deployment necessary against asylum seekers from Africa?
Sarcastically positive
Refugees welcome
20.3%
Drown 'em all
Yes, with snipers please
71%
6,335 respondents
May 2017 poll of PowNed, a popular shock news network allowed on public TV at Nederland 3.

At the moment I'm not aware of any additional Dutch polls on immigration, except one from 2017 by satirical, "conservative CIA"-type shock news outlet PowNed during the height of the refugee crisis. 6,335 respondents voted against Third World immigration to the tune of 98%. 71% called for snipers, 20% wanted to drown all illegal immigrants and 8% was sarcastically positive. Macabre? Not really. Just satire and humor - with a surprising dose of working class political reality.

The thing is, PowNed, despite having made it to Dutch state television, is primarily watched by people who are really bothered by the refusal of the mainstream media and politicians to address the immigration issue in any realistic way. It's part of a network that is tied to a variety of "populist" parties and news sites. So maybe the PowNed poll is not particularly representative of the Netherlands as a whole; maybe not even native white Netherlands. However, the jokes or "jokes" made most certainly reflect the immigration satire of a large part of predominantly the white male population. I heard jokes like these plenty of times over

the years, but usually only without any minority friends or colleagues in sight. Dutch people are very polite. Not as polite as the Swedes though.

Although this one too barely had any circulation, in 2020 another Dutch poll on immigration was published:

> *"From an indication of research bureau Kantar it turns out that 65 percent of Dutch people want to curb immigration. 91% doesn't even see any possibilities for more citizens. Noteworthy is also that 77% of Dutch people with a non-western background share that opinion.*
>
> *"The poll has been commissioned by [the slightly right-wing] De Telegraaf [newspaper], in relation to the annual population prognosis of the CBS [Central Bureau of Statistics]. From that prognosis it looks as if in 2039 possibly 19 million people will live in the Netherlands. ...*
>
> *'Two-thirds is in favor of curbing immigration, but that doesn't mean per se that the borders have to be locked down. This group mainly wants that immigration becomes more regulated," explains De Telegraaf reporter Daniel van Dam. ... 'We were also interested in the opinion of Dutch people with a non-western background and 48 percent of people of that group thinks that immigrations needs to be curbed.'"*[7]

It's quite the surreptitious poll, because the real question is, *"Do you want people from Third World countries coming over here?"* - split off per ethnic background. Instead Van Dam - who, based on some of his other articles, clearly is concerned about Third World immigration [8] - is pretending the questions are about overall population levels, regardless of ethnicity.

The results of the poll also are unclear, the most glaring problem being that the opinion of native white people has been left out in this news report. 65% of all individuals polled want to curb immigration, but only 48% of foreigners do... Mmmm, okay...

If the poll (correctly) assumed that 13.7% of the Netherlands in 2020 had a "non-Western background" and roughly worked that percentage into their poll, that would mean that 68% of native Dutch people and "Western immigrants" openly opposed additional immigration.

Well, wait, "Western immigrants" also includes the East Block actually these days. And looking at my Russian-Afghan and Polish-Iraqi neighbors, even more clear lines need to be drawn as to what a "non-Western" and "Western" immigrant is. It seems quite safe to say that

native Dutch people voted over 70% in this poll against additional immigration.

Then there's the ever-present issue that people are more willing to speak out against immigration when it is done so in an indirect manner: the Netherlands is too full, which on average 91% concluded, and even 77% of "non-Westerners" did - meaning that 93% of "Westerners" don't want any additional population growth, which in practice is the same thing as saying you are not too happy with immigration, because that literally is the only reason the population is growing.

Why would 93% of people think we can't add a few million people more to the Netherlands? Speaking as a Dutchman, there is still plenty of space left apart from the west of the country. Even in the west we could start building more skyscrapers, and with oil and gas being phased out everything is likely to become considerably cleaner. More synthetic meat would leave more space for building communities. The reader doesn't have to agree with any of these things. The point is simply: as technology increases, there are options. Why would 93% of "Westerners" not take such a thing into account? Well, most likely because they are protesting immigration...

Considering the fear of speaking out on Third World immigration, if we take the averages between the two questions asked, we'd have to conclude that roughly 80% of Dutch "Westerners" and 63% of immigrants - in contrast to the government and big business - have reservations about inviting more Third World immigrants here.

Certainly Google seems to look at this poll as a threat. I personally heard it discussed by the leader of a very obscure Dutch political party, Code Orange, whom one of my neighbors happened to vote on. Trying to find the poll in question online, I couldn't find anything. Immediately suspecting censorship, I went to Yahoo search. Lo and behold, with the same same search query, there the poll was, right at the number 1 spot:


Onderzoeksbureau Kantar stelde dat 91%
de Nederlanders vindt dat er geen ruimte
0:05 / 1:56
Mos over immigratie
kantar 91% nederlanders 77% allochtonen
All
News
Images
Maps
Google: Only 11 results listed, none the proper article.
http://www.nipo.nl › persberichten
DENK scoort onder Turken en Mar
27 Dec 2016 — Overall lijkt de huidige opkomstint
10-15% onder de opkomstintentie van autochtone
Missing: 77%
https://www.cbs.nl › media › imported › documents
Allochtonen in Nederland 2001 - Cl
1 Jan 2021 — 1990/'91–2000/'01 1) = boekjaar en
van niet-westerse allochtonen over Nederland.
Missing: kantar | Must include: kantar
https://www.cbs.nl › dossier-asiel-migratie-en-integ
Hoeveel mensen met een migratiea
kantar 91% nederlanders 77
All
Images
Videos
Yahoo: instantly found at no. 1
91% Nederlanders ziet ge
wnl.tv › 2020/02/08 › geen-mogelijkh
Feb 08, 2020 · 91% ziet geen kans v
indicatie van onderzoeksbureau Kan
beperken. 91 procent zegt helemaal
dat ook 77 procent van de Nederlan
Onderzoek Nederland Zoe
www.natuurenmilieu.nl › wp-content
bijvriendelijk openbaar groen (79%).
uitsterven van de bij een ramp zou be
Nederlanders wil iets doen om de bi
goed bekend is, weet 'slechts' een vij
Kantar: most people are lo
www.gsmarena.com › kantar_most_p
Jul 28, 2021 · Two thirds of people th

Typing in the same search query in Yahoo three months later, on November 1, 2021, and all of a sudden the article also doesn't show in Yahoo anymore. Isn't it fascinating how that goes?

Netherlands, 2026: 70% supports "remigration", 50% total immigration stop, and 83% less immigrants (for whites at least 75%+, 55%+, 88%+)

In January 2026 well known entertainment media outlet Hart van Nederland polled the population on immigration support versus opposition. The results were as follows:

> *Seven in ten respondents [70%] are 'very' or 'mostly' in favor of a broader remigration policy... On the other hand, 22 percent are mostly or very much against. 8 percent have no opinion on remigration. ...*
>
> *"Half of Dutch people believe that the Netherlands should completely stop receiving asylum seekers. Another 33 percent want to receive fewer asylum seekers... Three percent want to keep the policy as it is, and 13 percent advocate for more and better reception facilities. ...*
>
> *"Why do panel members want fewer asylum seekers? Ten most*

frequently cited reasons:

1. *Housing shortage is already too great (83%).*
2. *Concerns about safety and crime (74%).*
3. *Costs to society are too high (67%).*
4. *Too little control over who comes in (64%).*
5. *Concerns about maintaining Dutch norms and values (63%).*
6. *Excessive pressure on healthcare, education, and facilities (53%).*
7. *Little confidence in the current asylum policy (50%).*
8. *Fear of increasing tensions and conflicts (48%).*
9. *Integration is insufficient or too slow (47%).*
10. *Feels not heard enough (43%).*

„9

The issue with this poll, as always, is we don't know the percentage of native whites in it. It could realistically be anywhere from 6 to 9 out of every 10. Two million adult (18+) negroes, Arabs and Latino migrants on a population of 18 million seems like a realistic minimum anno 2026. That's 11%. If we situate ourselves a little below this percentage, it is likely that whites voted in favor of remigration, a full immigration stop, and lower immigration to the tune of 75%+, 55%+, and 88%+ respectively.

Sweden, 2011-2016: 55-63% of whites oppose immigration; 75%+ "doesn't disagree" with "too much" immigration

In Europe, it appears no country has higher support numbers for Third World immigration than Sweden. In 2011 Sweden was a total outlier in Europe: 33% of Swedes apparently didn't think there were "too many immigrants" in their country versus an average of 15% for the US and other European countries. Even with the Muslim and black vote taken out, barely 50% of (white) Swedes said there were "too many immigrants" versus 27% that "disagreed" - twice as many. Of course, this means you still have roughly 73% of Sweden "not disagreeing" with the notion that there are "too many immigrants". Any kind of referendum to stop immigration would likely pass with some ease, certainly among the white population. But still, what is it with Sweden? Maybe it's political indoctrination, because Swedish politicians are record holders for bizarre pro-immigration statements, openly saying that native white Swedish will have to adapt to Muslim and black "culture" - not vice versa.

What we see in recent years, however, is that even in uber-liberal Sweden opposition to Third World immigration is rising. It's not too hard to see why. Just the fact that Sweden has been allowing in large numbers of Somalis and other very criminal North-East Africans - both Muslim

and black - will guarantee that. There appear to be hardly any polls in existence to prove that though. The following one is an exception, and covers the years 2010-2015 very well. It was produced by the respected Swedish polling bureau Demoskop and commissioned by Den Nya Välfärden / The New Welfare, a foundation financed by 15,000 Swedish companies.


Do you think immigration into Sweden is...?
demoskop
May 25, 2015
'Allmänhetens uppfattning om invandringens omfattning'
2010 22 10 15 47% 52% 38 85% 7 3 3 2 13%
2011 20 11 16 47% 52% 39 86% 5 3 3 3 11%
2012 20 10 15 45% 50% 37 82% 6 4 3 6 13%
2013 25 10 15 50% 55% 33 83% 5 2 2 7 9%
2014 26 11 16 53% 58% 35 88% 6 4 3 13%
2015 30 11 17 58% 63% 34 92% 4 2 2 8%
0% 20% 40% 60% 80% 100%
7 way too high 6 5 4 neither to high nor too low 3 2 1 way too low no answer
% = +5% to better reflect white vote
Muslims (±5%), etc. part of poll to be "fair".

If we compare the year 2011 here with the earlier-discussed EU-wide poll of Ipsos MORI, we find very similar numbers: respectively 47% and 46% criticism that immigration numbers are too high. 2012 shows a decline in immigration opposition: 45%, but from about the time that the immigration crisis started, with Sweden taking in tons of additional Arab and black migrants from countries arguably (even) worse then they were used to, we see that opposition to immigration very rapidly rose: 50% in 2013, 53% in 2014, and 58% in 2015.

It seems quite clear that the immigrant population still needs to be taken out of this poll. The Muslim population stood at 6% in 2016, so I took 5% as an average for the years 2010-2015 - ignoring other immigration groups, mainly East Europeans. That means 58% opposition would theoretically turn into 63% opposition among native white Swedes. Even during the most "open minded" year, 2012, 50% of Sweden's white population could be counted on to vote in favor of closing the borders to Muslims and Arabs. Then again, if we split up the huge "neither too high nor too low" category based on the annual proportions between "too high" and "too low" voters, and it appears that 45% + 26% = 71% of Swedes even in the "year of open mindedness" was more of the opinion that immigration was "too high" than it was "too low". Cancel out the immigrant/Muslim vote and about 76% of Swedish whites - a solid three out of four - probably could be counted on to privately admit that immigration is bit out of hand. Of course, there's also 6% in 2012 that refused to give an opinion. Why is that? What ethnicities can be found in that category? That would be really nice to know. It certainly is interesting that in 2015 this category had completely disappeared, with the "too high" camp exploding and the "too low" opposition either remaining the same or decreasing.

One gets the impression that political correctness has been choking Swedes. Apart from that, it is quite scary to look at the specifics of the Swedish poll. Women always trail a solid 10% behind men, despite the fact that they are the primary victims of Arab and black sexual assault. Just as scary, the highest-educated group only supported the "too many immigrants" statement to the tune of 19-22% in 2010, 2012 and 2014, versus a more consistent 53% average or so for the lower educated groups. Then, in 2015, the higher-educated group bumped up to 41%. What is it with women and educated people? It appears women can't separate (controversial) fact from emotion and are more susceptible to psychological pressure, while wealthier and higher-educated individuals either don't care and, similar to women, are more submissive to authority. Clearly the lower-educated masses here have been quicker to pick up a problematic trend than the class you'd expect it from.

Also a bit worrying in the Swedish poll is that the youngest group - below the age of 29 - became the most pro-immigration group almost overnight. In 2010-2011 it was polling similar to 50-64 year olds and just below the 65+ categories. But in 2012 immigration opposition dropped from 39% to just 20%, far below all other age groups. It has remained the lowest since. What's the reason? Young migrants? An increase in school and social media (Instagram and TikTok) indoctrination? Who knows. But it is a development that begs an explanation.

THE UNITED STATES

Differences between US and EU immigration

The situation in the United States regarding immigration is different from Europe for a number of reasons:

1. A much greater percentage of the U.S. has already become non-white due to an already present 11-12% black population, followed by massive immigration from Mexico in the wake of the NAFTA accords that wiped out millions of Mexican farmers (CIA drug trafficking with successive Mexican governments might be another reason). Anno 2018 U.S. whites sit around 61% and has been dropping 0.5% per year. Compare this to western Europe where the numbers still are 75-90% - although here also the white percentage is in freefall.

2. Primary immigration into the U.S. has been from Latin America, which, while very problematic, has lower crime numbers than Arabs and certainly way lower than African blacks. Just as important, Latinos don't bring the extreme cultural division as seen with Arabs, who generally loathe western culture due to religious

indoctrination. U.S. citizens are still largely unaware of just how much problems large numbers of Arab immigrants are going to bring them.

3. Media spin in the U.S. has resulted in a focus on "illegal" immigration, with the most bizarre debates going on whether or not illegals should be given healthcare, driver's licenses and other benefits. This buffer is hardly present in the EU media. The focus here is still is on traditional, legal immigration - sanctioned by the government - being out of control.

4. Blatant political propaganda is much more acceptable in the U.S. For the moment it's (still) hard to be taken serious by the masses in the EU if you use a word like "dreamers" for immigrants, in part also because of the different nature of the immigration.

5. There's construed but nevertheless clannish division among liberal Democrats and conservative Republicans in the U.S., complete with very vindictive, unprofessional behavior in the media. In the EU there's more of us-vs-them (the people vs mainstream political parties) feeling, because all parties, except for the recent "populist" ones, are variations of the globalist Democrat Party (and minor Green Party) in the U.S. in the sense that they all are pro-Third World immigration - the supposedly anti-establishment socialist and green ones even harder than the more mainstream ones. The U.S. system might make it harder for liberal Democrats in particular to speak out about immigration.

U.S.: 70% vocal white immigration opposition; 60% for minorities

Getting a hand on what native white citizens in the United States think about immigration has been quite difficult. I extensively covered this issue for my native Netherlands, where none of the natives have anything positive to say about Third World immigrants, except from the Far East (which foreigners wouldn't know from the media). After researching other countries, it turned out that the Dutch might well be the most outspoken (yet-still-very-liberal-and-open-minded) on the issue of Third World immigration. That is not a good sign, because over here there is still tons of fear due to psychological warfare from the mainstream media. Slowly but surely, after a lot of research, I could detect very similar sentiments on a handful of forums and comment sections of news websites in countries as Belgium, Germany, Sweden and Norway, but one really has to know where to look. There also tends to be less available material than in the Netherlands.

Before setting out on this quest, I expected to find quite a bit about immigration sentiment in English-speaking countries as Great Britain and the United States, this because I actually speak the language properly, because they are (relatively) largely countries with huge online presences, and because they face roughly similar immigration issues. Well, that was a rude awakening. To this day, the lack of critical online discussion of Muslim immigration into Great Britain continues to surprise me. You can tell though that there is a huge political clamp-down on the issue because the Pakistani "grooming" scandals (involving white victims) never came out until recent times, despite the fact that the newspapers over here in neighboring Netherlands have regularly reported since the mid 1990s of large numbers of gang molestations of Muslim youths in swimming pools - similarly involving white "whores" (read: teenage girls in bathing clothes). Obviously, Brexit of 2016 and the earlier discussed anti-immigration polls for Great Britain showing, amongst others, 79.7% outspoken support among whites to lower immigration levels, reveals that something has been boiling beneath the surface with the British, something they are unfortunately not willing to discuss online (they won't get the chance in the media, so this is about the only recourse).

The only major exception might be the comment section of the Daily Mail. You can often find massive support for very balanced and rational anti-immigration statements here that you won't find discussed by the media. Unfortunately, these reply sections feature little more than one-liners (thus no personal experience anecdotes) and, worse, these type of articles of the Daily Mail often receive links from ultraright conservative websites as Breitbart and Alex Jones' Infowars.

Here we immediately arrived at the problem with the United States. Try to find any honest opinion on Third World immigration here in online forums and news sections that is A) not very clearly conservative propaganda; and B) does not involve forums as the pro-Nazi Stormfront or NiggerMania.com, the former of which is tightly interlocked with the Nazi conspiracy disinformation show Rense, which immediately brings in the CIA and huge numbers of CIA assets posing as independent researchers - and most likely also as independent forum dwellers at Stormfront. In other words, there's a very obvious agenda to discredit both conspiracy and immigration criticism by associating them with the Nazi movement. Finding anything in the United States that doesn't involve the security state or politically-charged bickering is next to impossible.

Occasionally you do bump into genuine frustrations, however, that provide some insight into the situation in the U.S. For example, in 2011 Adam Carolla spoke his mind on the Joe Rogan Experience podcast on

Latin American immigration into California. He painted an extremely recognizable picture when compared to western Europe, except that nobody here would refer to Muslims and likely also not to African blacks as "brothers". Joe Rogan, who did what he could to pooh-pooh the subject (although he did admit early on, *"I've only lived here [in LA] since '94, but it's a big difference."*), is a clear-cut CIA conspiracy disinformation asset, once again making the pernicious influence of the security state in American life all too clear.

> *"It's essentially turning into Mexico, which is a shit place. ... No one want to talk about this, but Mexico is a shitty place to live. So the deal is we can absorb as a society X amount of folks from Mexico a year before we turn into Mexico. If we turn into Mexico, then we are a shit joint too. That's it. It's easy math. ...*
>
> *"What we're offering is education... an ability a move forward. ... Now, through the fact that when the populous grows too large where you can speak your own language. You don't have to learn this language. You can work within your community. ... I've got street signs in English and Spanish. When I call 911 or 411, I get the English and Spanish. ... Come on out to LA. Walk around LA. Tell me what you're thinking. ... School system? Fucking unusable. Barbwire around every freeway sign. Gangs tagging everything - fucking nature: rocks and trees. It's a fucking traffic nightmare. ...*
>
> *"The high school graduation rate of the Latino kids is like under 50 percent or so. It's fucking insane. ... And because no one wants to be perceived as racist, we just turn a blind eye to it. ... We're all thinking [the same thing.] And by the way, all these fucking hypocrite assholes who go, "What do you mean? What's wrong with these people? They're proud. They're hardworking." Okay, why you're sending your kid to private school? Send 'em all down to Hollywood High. Come, send 'em all in! Go ahead! Why not? Why not, hypocrite? Who's the fucking racist? ...*
>
> *"The mayor of Los Angeles [2005-2013, who was named Tony Villar - [he] changed his named to [Antonio] Villaraigosa ... since he realized he'd get more votes if he was one of them. ... And he was involved with [the Soros and Ford Foundation-funded] La Raza... Here's what's gonna happen. There is gonna be white flight. The Joe Rogans and Adam Carollas are moving to Seattle and then LA can just become a little slice of Mexico. ...*
>
> *"There are a few things you can do. First off, you can beef up the border. Second, you can start calling cultures on the things they are doing good and not good. You can say, "Brother, stop knocking up chicks and moving on. Start*

> *hanging out and raising a family, because the second you move on the whole system is going to hell in a fucking hand basket. Hey Latins, stop shitting out kids. You guys are having too many kids. Slow the fuck down.""*[10]

Looking at the replies to this YouTube clip, we see top comments as:

- 240 likes: *"I'm Mexican and I approve this message."*
- 234 likes: *"I'm a Hispanic that lives in L.A and this is the truth. They are turning this place into Mexico :("*
- 184 likes: *"This is why I left California. I love Ohio. I'm back in America again."*
- 129 likes: *"I am sick of California, I didn't work so hard to have a home here in California to live in Mexico. California has turned into Mexico, may as well live in TJ. Voting For Trump."*
- 79 likes: *"So true. California sucks. Infested by illegals...INFESTED!"*
- 61 likes: *"I totally agree with all this, But when I bring up any of this to talk about this, I get labeled racist."*
- 38 likes: *"Asia for the Asians, Africa for the Africans, White countries for everybody! The reality is that a brown-skinned society means a place of poverty."*
- 37 likes: *"Mexicans and Hispanics are leeches. What great inventions and advancements in technology and medicines have they discovered? Thank God for Europeans and their descendants."*
- 22 likes: *"Dumbasses stop in front of my house, at the stop sign (in the S.F. Valley), open [their] door and pour out their fast food bags trash and empty beer cans and bottles. It pisses me off seriously!!! Truth is 99% are Mexicans that do that... I myself [am] of Hispanic decent... its embarrassing."*

What is available in the media is not enough for outsiders to get any kind of clear picture of what is going on in California (similar to Americans not having a good picture of Muslim and African black immigration into Europe, at least not outside ISGP, but what is clear is that there exists a lot of frustration not only among whites, but also a portion of the Hispanics, about the behavior of Latin American immigrants into California. But what about the polls? At this point it should be clear that a lot of manipulation exists, but what do they say? Well, turns out they show a lot of frustration - a whole lot - and paint a completely different picture than the media has been feeding the masses.

For starters, this article started out with a discussion of a 2017 poll showing that on average about 60% of European whites outspokenly agreed with permanently banning ALL Muslim immigration into Europe. This poll was taken right at the time that Trump tried to implement a more mild policy of temporarily banning immigrants from a number of Muslim countries. The media went nuts and Obama-allied, Black Lives

Matter-supporting and Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation-financed judges thwarted these executive orders of Trump. The fact remains that European whites were on the side of Trump. But what about American whites? Well, not only did they vote for Trump to the tune of 58%, a fact completely ignored by the media, but they also support Trump's anti-Muslim and anti-immigration policies to a very large extent.

For example, in 2016 an OpinionSavvy poll showed that 70% of "Americans" of all ethnicities supported screening individuals for potential Sharia support (most overseas Muslims support Sharia Law), with 59% saying that individuals who support Sharia shouldn't be allowed into the country. Unfortunately, the poll didn't distinguish between "center-immigration" and "brief stays", which probably would have resulted in somewhat higher levels of support. In addition, 78% of Americans agreed to the notion that visitors and immigrants from foreign cultures should subvert their own culture for the duration of their stay in the United States. Considering U.S. whites only constituted about 62% of the population at that point and that this poll contained more than twice the number of Muslims that should have been in it, and also contained more Democrats than Republicans [11], we can surmise with some certainty that about 75% of U.S. whites supported screening Muslims, with about 65% having little appetite of letting Muslims (as said, most overseas ones support Sharia Law) settle into the country. This is very similar to the numbers among European whites (an estimated 60-65% outspoken support, with a lot of quiet agreement).

The second poll discussed at the beginning of this article involved a joint U.S.-E.U. immigration sentiment poll from 2011, which revealed 59% agreement among all "Americans" - at the time roughly consisting of 65% white, 16% Latino, 11% black, 1% Muslim, 5% Asian - with the statement *"There are too many immigrants in our country"*.


"There are too many immigrants in our country"
% Strongly/Tend to agree
EU: only 16-64 included! US: 18-64! (+3% compensation)
Belgium 4% 8% 11% disagrees 72% 75% 83%
UK 6% 9% 12% disagrees 71% 74% 80%
Italy 11% 13% 16% disagrees 67% 70% 72%
Spain 6% 8% 11% disagrees 67% 70% 75%
US 8% 11% 14% disagrees 59% 62% 67%*
*Different method: U.S. white opposition known to sit ±11% above minorities.
Germany 14% 17% 20% disagrees 53% 56% 61%
France 13% 17% 20% disagrees 52% 55% 63%
Sweden 27% 30% 33% disagrees 46% 49% 54%
Canada 22% 26% 29% disagrees 42% 45% 53%
Mexico 13% 14% 17% disagrees 37% 40% 41%
Ipsos
Remaining %: People who didn't agree nor disagree.
Q. "Please tell me whether you agree or disagree with each of the following statements"
Global @dvisor
© 2011 Ipsos
Red percentage: Arab and black population excluded in EU. Only 50% with disagrees.
Edits by ISGP-studies.com '18
Like most polls, this one (silently) INCLUDES IMMIGRANT VOTERS relative to the country's percentage. Also: Only 16/18-64 years of age, EXCLUDING SENIORS, a group that heavily votes against Third World immigration!
EU Arab + black immigrant numbers for 2011, plus main immigration group: Belgium: 8% (Moroccans), UK: 6%, (Pakistanis), Italy: 1.5% (Moroccans, Egyptians), Spain: 4.5% (Moroccans), Germany: 5% (Turks), France: 8% (NW Africa), Sweden: 4.5% (Syrians, Iraqis). East Europeans not included.
North America: Mexico: 1% (0.003% Muslim + 1% black), Canada: 7.5% (6% Arab and black from all over) + 1.5% hispanic), US: 27% (0.5% Arab + 11% black + 15.5% hispanic).

62% would have been a more accurate number to start with, considering anyone above the age of 64 was filtered out, a huge age group in this era

of graying populations that is known to be statistically very outspoken against Third World immigration.

Compared to EU countries, where immigration is dominated by Arabs and African blacks, the U.S. anti-immigration percentage has been corrected to a lesser extent with Third World immigrants included in the poll, because ethnic minorities in the U.S. are known to oppose additional Third World immigration at roughly 10 percent point lower rates than whites. The difference really isn't that big here. Thus another 5% percent - making it 67% - seems quite realistic for the white population anno 2011.

To illustrate the opposition of U.S. minorities to Third World immigration, in November 2009 the Center for Immigration Studies commissioned the Zogby polling bureau to specifically research just this aspect of immigration opposition. In February 2010 the center published its report. It contained the following numbers and conclusions:

is the number of immigrants entering the country each year too high, too low, or just right?

	Likely Voters			
	Too High	Too Low	Just Right	Not Sure
All Likely Voters	67 %	4 %	14 %	15 %
Hispanics	56 %	7 %	20 %	17 %
African-Americans	68 %	4 %	14 %	15 %
Asian-Americans	57 %	5 %	18 %	20 %

* Totals do not equal 100 percent in some cases because of rounding.

> *"This survey of minority voters shows that when it comes to the issue of legalizing illegal immigrants, these voters disagree with the leadership of many [Rockefeller, Soros, Ford Foundation and corporate-funded] ethnic advocacy groups. Most voters want the law enforced and illegal immigrants to return to their home countries. ... Most think the level of immigration is too high and very few think it is too low. Not surprisingly, when it comes to allowing more unskilled workers into the country, most Hispanic, Asian-American, and African-American voters feel there are plenty of Americans here to do such work; employers just need to pay more. ...*
>
> *"When some leaders of minority groups speak on immigration and argue for legalization they are merely offering their own personal opinions, not necessarily those of voters in these communities."*

While it is not explicitly stated (the word "white" doesn't appear anywhere in the report), "All Likely Voters" appears to involve all poll participants, including the predominantly white ones. The average of the minority groups - with taking sample/population size into account - is 59.5%, far higher than the "All Likely Voters" average. In order to get the

listed 67% average for "All Likely Voters", the remaining 3,300, predominantly white voters would have needed to vote "too high" roughly to the tune of 71%. That is with small percentages of Muslims, Native Indians and other unlisted minority groups already subtracted from the population percentage.

Another poll within this study reveals widespread criticism of the lax immigration policies under the Clinton, Bush and Obama governments among not just whites, but also all minority groups. Minority groups listed here averaged 65.5% in their criticism of successive governments on this issue. Based on a similar calculation as above, the remaining group, predominantly whites, would have criticized U.S. governments on this issue to the tune of 78%.

Question 2. There are currently estimated to be 11 to 12 million illegal immigrants in the U.S. Which of these statements best reflects your opinion as to why that is? **Statement A:** Past efforts to enforce immigration laws have been grossly inadequate and the government has never made a real effort to enforce the law. **Statement B:** We have made a real effort to enforce our immigration laws, but we have failed because we are not allowing in enough immigrants legally.

	Likely Voters			
	Statement A	Statement B	Neither	Not Sure
All Likely Voters	74 %	13 %	9 %	4 %
Hispanics	61 %	20 %	15 %	5 %
African-Americans	70 %	16 %	7 %	8 %
Asian-Americans	69 %	19 %	7 %	5 %

* Totals do not equal 100 percent in some cases because of rounding.

This 2010 Center for Immigration Studies report shows that Hispanic immigrants in particular are a bit milder on how to deal with legal and illegal immigrants, but that overall there's not nearly as much "division" on the issue of immigration as liberal Democrat elites and pro-Third World immigration action groups funded by George Soros and the Ford Foundation want us to believe.

Opposition to (non-illegal) Third World immigration among both whites and minorities has continued over the years. An April 2018 report by The Polling Company included the question: *"Current federal policy adds about one million new immigrants with lifetime work permits into the U.S. each year. [What is] the number of new immigrants the government should be adding each year?"* The results:

> *"Over 6-in-10 Hispanic and Latino voters (62%) believe that the federal government should be adding less immigrants with lifetime work permits into the U.S. each year than the approximately one million allowed under current federal policy. A strong plurality of all voters (46%) believe that the government should only be allowing*

> *250,000 or less new immigrants with lifetime work permits into the U.S. a year, with 11% of voters believing the level should be 500,000, and 5% stating levels of 750,000."*

That's 62% of Latinos and 64% overall who said they want less - most of them saying far less - immigrants coming into the U.S. than the government allows for. Additionally important is that this report fails to mention that 19% of the persons polled refrained from giving their opinion, making it quite clear that easily more than 50% want to cut off virtually all Third World immigration into the United States. Interesting to see in this poll is that the 65+ category often was less opposed to immigration than the 45-64 bracket, although not as much as the 18-44 bracket. The only shockingly low numbers for immigration opposition listed by The Polling Company came from registered Democrats. Here's how the question of chain migration - the bringing in of extended family members beyond partner and children - was answered:

	Limit Migration	Continue Chain Migration	DIFF
Men (50%)	49%	38%	+11
Women (50%)	51%	37%	+14
18-44 (38%)	47%	44%	+3
45-64 (41%)	52%	34%	+18
65+ (21%)	52%	33%	+19
Republican (22%)	70%	20%	+50
Democrat (37%)	41%	48%	-7
Independent (40%)	48%	38%	+10

Notice that there is always a portion of participants refusing to give their opinion. Based on the listed percentages, in most cases these abstainers clearly swing towards immigration opposition.

Quite possibly the answer is to be found in the fact that tons of Hispanics, and especially blacks, are voting Democrat, groups that still have somewhat lower numbers of immigration opposition than whites. Otherwise we have to assume that this is just a case of Democrats in particular feeling pressure to support immigration.

"Assume" might actually be a big word, because an October 2005 - February 2006 study of UCLA Berkeley professor Alexander Janus shows just that: people, especially white, educated liberals, are absolutely terrified of expressing anti-immigration opinions, even in private. Janus' poll was as sneaky as it was brilliant. He divided his sample into two roughly similar groups of 350 white people. Group one was presented with a list of three basic positions:

1. Federal assistance to the poor.
2. Athletes making millions of dollars per year.
3. Corporations polluting the environment.

Participants only had to say HOW MANY statements they agreed with - NOT which one(s).

The second group was presented with the exact same positions, except that a fourth one was added:

- *"Cutting off immigration to the United States."*

This way of polling is called the "unobtrusive method", as it gives poll participants total deniability.

A VERY interesting thing happened: based on the suddenly heightened number of "agrees" in the second group, it could be estimated that roughly 61% of participants had agreed with the notion that immigration to the U.S. should be cut off. That's very interesting, because when questioned directly about cutting off immigration, Janus found that only 42% of participants agreed with this position. Thus it is clear that poll participants were hiding their true feelings on the subject. Janus' study showed that liberal Democrats and college graduates in particular are prone to censoring themselves on this controversial issue. Incredibly, when asked through the "unobtrusive method", liberal Democrats oppose immigration as much or even more than Republicans.

TABLE 2 Table condensed by ISGP-studies.com '18 for readability

Estimates from the List Experiment and a Direct Question of Support for Immigration Restrictionism

Characteristic	Unobtrusive Estimate	Obtrusive Estimate	Difference
Population	61***%	42%	19***
Educational Attainment			
HS diploma/GED or less	60***%	49%	11
Some college	65***%	48%	17
College graduate	71***%	29%	42***
Graduate/professional degree	41***%	30%	11
Political Ideology			
Liberal	71***%	26%	44***
Moderate	64***%	44%	20**
Conservative	62***%	47%	14
Political Party			
Democrat	63***%	33%	30**
Republican	65***%	44%	20*
Independent	56***%	44%	12
Group Affect			
Cool	59***%	51%	8
Warm	69***%	30%	40***

*$p<0.10$; **$p<0.05$; ***$p<0.01$.

NOTE: Non-Hispanic white respondents only. $N = 689$.

SOURCE: Time-Sharing Experiments for the Social Sciences Janus Module, fielded from October 2005 through February 2006.

In addition, Janus noted:

> *"Immigration scholars have supposedly identified two significant pockets of tolerance among the U.S. [and also Europe's] population: the highly educated ... and political liberals... In this article I ask whether the influence of social desirability pressures in the survey interview is responsible for this finding. ...*

> *"Political liberals are considerably more likely than moderates or conservatives to conceal support for immigration restrictionism. While 26 percent of liberals claim to support cutting off immigration in response to a direct question, 71 percent of liberals [when asked indirectly] support immigration restrictionism. ...*
>
> *"The results suggest that respondents mask their opposition and [that] underlying anti-immigration sentiment is far higher than direct estimates suggest even before the financial crisis... We implore future efforts to measure anti-immigration sentiment to be cautious about direct measurement of opposition, as these measures underestimate anti-immigration sentiment..."*[12]

This study still leaves us with a number of questions. For example, why college graduates all of sudden start to score so low on immigration opposition compared to persons who had "some college". As I suggested earlier in relation to Sweden (before even knowing this study existed), to a large degree higher levels of education correspond to socially acceptable, compliant behavior. Simply put, the higher the level of education, the less number of "brave", "rebellious" citizens you are going to find. At the same time the higher educated individuals most likely have the least amount of worries, as they generally the most amount of money and can live far away from immigration centers. Of course we would need more of these polls to confirm this speculation.

What can be concluded with quite a bit of certainty though from this study is that roughly one-third of all citizens - 19% out 61% - are censoring themselves on the immigration issue. What remains interesting to ask though is why support for "cutting off immigration" was so low from the get-go: just 42%, followed by 61% through the "unobtrusive method". Ipsos was polling roughly 61% through the basic, direct, "obtrusive method" in 2011 - and that was with all nationalities involved. The 2009 Zogby poll showed roughly 71% support among whites on this issue, with roughly 78% criticizing the government's lax policy on immigration enforcement. With The Polling Company in April 2018, together, Republicans, Democrats and Independents - with minority groups included - roughly opposed immigration to the tune of 53%. So what is going with the 42%-61% of Janus' study that involved only non-Hispanic whites? This low number seems to make little sense. The answer here might lie in the difference in the questions posed, an aspect that has already been discussed and criticized in relation to a number of previous international polls. In Janus' study, participants were presented with the rather radical and sweeping position *"Cutting off immigration to the United States."* Especially intellectuals might go here, *"What does this mean? Third World immigration? All immigration? Even*

from western Europe?" As a result, a lot of participants may have kept things in the middle and not "agreed" to this position. On the other hand, if a statement was made along the lines as *"Too many unskilled Third World immigrants have been coming into the United States,"* support most likely would be a higher from the get-go. Most important though is that this poll shows that college-educated, liberal Democrats in particular are censoring themselves on the immigration issue en masse. That's a big problem, especially in a supposedly free society.

Summary of U.S. polls: 70% white/60% minority opposition

These numbers - generally calculated/estimated numbers from official polls to single out the white vote - are discussed in much more detail in the previous section. Over time additional polls might be added here.

- **2005-2006:** According to a study of UCLA Berkeley professor Alexander Janus, 42% of whites support the somewhat sweeping and vague position of *"cutting off immigration to the U.S."*, but when asked in an "unobtrusive" manner, 61% turn out to support this measure, with college-educated liberal Democrats in particular censoring themselves en masse. The 42% baseline is incredible low, however.

- **2001-2017 (only discussed here):** Over this period Gallop polled that an average of 61.4% of U.S. citizens of all ethnicities *"[worried] a great/fair amount about illegal immigration"*. This generally means about 71-72% of white citizens. Gallup didn't exclude the white vote, nor did it keep in mind that the white population dropped from roughly 68.5% to 61.5% in this period (interesting how I had to go to DuckDuckGo instead of Google to quickly get historical demographics for whites in the U.S.). It also excludes from its reported 59% average the years 2006-2011, because it had heightened concerns about immigration. Furthermore, Gallop pretended that the crisis was over (only heightened deportations keep the number of illegals stable at roughly 11.5 million since 2006), and ignored the influence of legal immigration and the more modern refugee crisis - all revealing just how biased the polling agency is. Shockingly, a very steady 78-79% of Republicans have continued to be worried about the illegal immigration issue from 2006 on, while Democrats dropped from 60 to just 48% concern. Clearly the increasingly large number of ethnic minorities in the Democrat Party and liberal superclass propaganda have been responsible for this widening gap. [13] 71.5% for the white population will be used as the average here.

- **2009:** According to Zogby and the Center for Immigration Studies, 67% of all Americans agree that the number of immigrants into the

U.S. is too high. 59.5% of Latino, black and Asian minorities support this notion and roughly 71% of whites. 78% of all Americans agree that *"the government has never made a real effort to enforce the law"* regarding immigration. Only 71% is used here to calculate an average white opposition.

- **2011:** According to Ipsos MORI, roughly 62% of all ethnicities and 67% of whites agree with statement: *"There are too many immigrants in the U.S."*.

- **2016:** An OpinionSavvy polls shows that 70% of all American ethnicities and thus about 75% of whites support screening at the borders for Sharia-supporting Muslims. 59% of them (about 65% of whites) don't want them allowed entrance into the U.S. 78% (over 80% of whites) says foreigners need to adapt to U.S. culture while residing in the U.S.

- **2018:** According to The Polling Company, 62% of Latinos and 64% of all ethnicities (thus about 74% of whites) say they want less immigrants coming into the United States than the government annually allows for. 49% of these want the lowest possible immigration numbers. Only 10% votes to see levels of immigration increased. 19% abstains from giving their opinion.

Estimated average opposition to "center-immigration" ("Third World" is seldom specified) among U.S. whites in the 6 polls discussed here comes down to: 61% + 71.5% + 71% + 67% + 75% + 74% = 419.5% / 6 = 69.92%, a percentage we can nicely and properly round off to 70%. This means roughly 60% support from minorities.

Also interesting is that in 2017 39% of respondents of all ethnicities agreed with the loaded notion that *"white people are currently under attack in this country."* This is well over 1 in 3 and could possibly come down to about half of all whites having this opinion, this with the media establishment (and poll taker Ipsos MORI) putting aside this theory as a "white supremacist" "conspiracy theory". [14] It's another example of the establishment narrative simply being propaganda, nothing more.

Australia: Over 52% of whites want Muslim ban anno 2017; maybe 33% opposes

For many years Australia has been seen as a place to escape to by western Europeans. Until the 1970s it even had a White Australia policy, making it very tough for any non-whites to come into the country. To this day Australia has relatively tough immigration standards, which has

kept it from being swamped in similar ways as western Europe in particular.

As for the specific numbers, in 2016 Australia approximately consisted of 5.6% Chinese and 2.8% Indians. Compared to Europe or the United States, that really isn't so bad. Chinese people, while notorious tourists, have slightly higher genetic IQs than whites and also lower crime numbers. Compare that to African blacks who have anywhere from 10 to 25 times the street crime numbers, combined with much lower genetic IQ numbers. That's also something Australians have noticed with the native Aborigines, who stand at about 2% of the total population, but easily have 10 times the incarceration rate of whites. As for the Indians, they are more problematic than the Chinese to have in terms of crime, but still consistently more cultured than Arabs (many Indians are also to be found in Great Britain and quite a few also in mainland Europe). They have better family structure, with women having equal rights. Or close to equal rights.

Looking at these numbers, Australia has continued to be a good place for European whites to migrate to. However, in recent years, Muslim immigration has exploded here also. In June 2011 just 1.5% of Australia was Muslim. In June 2017 it had grown to a worrying 2.6%, no less than a 77% increase in 6 years. [15] If that trend of about 0.18% per year continues, then by mid 2019 3% of Australia is going to be Muslim, and roughly 5.5% by 2025, on par with many western European countries today. Looking at these numbers, undoubtedly Australians have already noticed considerable ghetto-forming in major cities, major increases here in anti-social behavior, and also that a number of swimming pools have become far less safe for their unaccompanied white daughters. I'm not even going to check.

To summarize anno 2018 Australia has roughly 3% Indians and 2.8% Muslims and 2.6% Aborigines. That's 8.4% of problematic or reasonably problematic ethnicities. There are other low numbers of other Third World nationalities present, so it should be extremely safe to add 3% to any public poll (mainly dealing with Muslims) to get a better sense of the white vote. On the poll numbers:

In light of the Trump election, in September 2016 Australian polling service Essential reported that 49% of poll participants supported a (full) ban on Muslim immigration into Australia, based on the question: *"Would you support or oppose a ban on Muslim immigration to Australia?"* [16] 11% was undecided and a surprisingly large percentage (compared to Europe) - primarily those affiliated with the Labor and especially Green parties - actively opposed it. This means that if a referendum were to be held on the issue, with only "yes" or "no" allowed, it should pass with a comfortable about 55%.

Q. Would you support or oppose a ban on Muslim immigration to Australia?

Essential poll Sep. 2016	Total	Men	Women	Aged 18-24	Aged 25-34	Aged 35-44	Aged 45-54	Aged 55-64	Aged 65+
Total support	49% 52%	48%	49%	28% ??	44%	48%	60%	47%	60%
Total oppose	40% 37%	41%	40%	58%	42%	38%	32%	42%	33%
Strongly support	28%	27%	28%	14%	26%	29%	35%	24%	32%
Support	21%	21%	21%	14%	18%	19%	25%	23%	28%
Oppose	19%	20%	19%	25%	20%	17%	15%	18%	21%
Strongly oppose	21%	21%	21%	33%	22%	21%	17%	24%	12%
Don't know	11%	11%	11%	14%	13%	14%	8%	11%	8%

Poll demographics: 2.5% Muslims, 2.5% Aborigines, 3% Indians, and 6% Chinese, ~85% whites.

That is without looking at the primary vote that counts: the white vote. Compensate with 3% and 52% of Australian whites vocally supported Donald Trump in his supposedly "racist", "hateful" Muslim ban, with no more than 37% opposing. That's lower than in Europe, where, after removing the Muslim vote from countries, average opposition rose from 55 to 60% and opposition declined from 20 to 15%. The obvious explanation is that Australians still have lower numbers of Muslim immigrants at this point, and also far less Sub-Saharan African ones.

Looking deeper at the poll, what is primarily worrying to see is the EXTREMELY low level of support for the ban among 18 to 24-year-olds. Just 28%! Move one bracket higher, 25 to 34, and all of a sudden there's majority support of 44%. We have to know for certain what is causing these low levels of support among youngsters. Two key explanations here are large numbers of young immigrants (indicating higher levels of overall white support than just 53%) and (very liberal) white school children and college students being deathly afraid to voice any opposition to immigration. Already in the U.S. we have seen that liberal brainwashing is working very effectively, especially among the young and educated. This aspect really should be studied more in depth, because unscientific indoctrination and brainwashing is completely criminal.

An additional 2017 poll of the Australian Population Research Institute among 2,000 Australians revealed the following numbers [17]: 74% of all Australians thought their country is *"already full"*, the officially provided reasons being an ever increasing amount of problems with traffic jams and affordable housing. 54% wanted a cut in annual immigration intake. Finally, 48% backed a partial ban on Muslim immigration, one percent point lower than the year before (amidst more mass Third World immigration).

Let's look a little deeper at this last number: 48% in favor of a Muslim ban, 25% opposition and 27% undecided. The big difference here with the 2016 poll is that many of the poll participants went from "oppose" to "undecided". In other words, the vocal "oppose" number may have gone down 1%, but the vocal opposition went down a huge 15 per cent points.

If we split up the "undecided" category two-to-one based on the ratio between "support" vs "oppose" and a purely "yes"-"no" referendum is likely to pass 66%. Stripping the Muslim vote from the results and a very easy 51% of Australian whites vocally oppose immigration, with roughly 69% of all non-Muslim voters in Australia wanting Muslim banned from entering the country. Those are some serious numbers. And opposition is likely only to increase.

To be realistic, estimated opposition among white Australians of 51-52% by taking out the Muslim share is highly insufficient for a realistic estimate. It's more than likely that a higher percentage of whites are voting for a Muslim ban than Third World immigrant groups, if only out of fear that a ban on other Third World immigrants is going to be next, followed in the future by deportations. Realistic estimates for Australian whites who vocally support a Muslim ban probably sit around 55% (I'll say 52% here), with another 15% willing to jump on board by 2025 if the situation continues to escalate. At that point Muslim immigration numbers will be roughly equal to various western European countries, which are seeing a relatively stable 60-80% vocal white opposition to any additional Muslim immigration.

Australians on Muslim immigration: "God help us"; government fraud with numbers coming in?

The following list of opinions on Muslim immigration come from the earlier-mentioned Daily Mail article that reported that the number of Muslims in Australia increased 77% between 2011 and 2017. Whether or not the Daily Mail draws more right-wing readers than left-wing, I'm not sure, but I find these opinions extremely recognizable among white people here in western Europe about Muslim and other Third World immigration. Many of these individual experiences and opinions have earlier been documented in ISGP's article on Muslim gang assault in western European swimming pools.

Very interesting also among these comments is the repeated claim that the Australian government is discouraging Arabs from registering as Muslims as a way to drive down the official Muslim/Arab immigration numbers. Obviously it would be much better to base any Muslim numbers on the countries and regions immigrants are coming from, rather than to focus on how many registered as "Muslim". It would be very typical of a globalist western government to introduce a manipulation like this, but who knows if it is true? For now, I'm not doing any additional research.

- 482 likes, 32 dislikes (Indian): *"The Australian government should seriously consider implementing a ban on immigrants from certain countries before it is too late."*

- 426 likes, 29 dislikes (British): *"Where Britain goes Australia follows."*
- 404 likes, 23 dislikes (Australian): *"I can guarantee you the true number is over 5%. And if we are to believe its 2.6% then why do [they] have so much control over our ways at such a low number?"*
- 679 likes, 43 dislikes (Australian): *"There are many more than 600,000 Muslims in Australia. Muslims are encouraged to not state their religion on the Census form so that no-one knows the true number."*
- 168 likes, 4 dislikes (Australian): *"The figure is actually greater. They are urged not to enter their religion on the their census forms!"*
- 99 likes, dislikes (Australian): *"That's right - I've heard that too [about the census forms]."*
- 58 likes, 10 dislikes (Australian): *""number of Muslims living in the country has almost doubled from 341,000 in the the 2006 census." ... "Census revealed an additional 2.2 million people registered as having no religion. [**note:** how many of these came from the Middle East?]""*
- 565 likes, 51 dislikes (Australian): *"That's a worry."*
- 619 likes, 51 dislikes (Australian): *"Before this gets way out of hand like in Europe and the UK ... this has to stop. "*
- 249 likes, 12 dislikes (Australian): *"Sadly this looks like the end of Australia as we know it. Thanks pollies."*
- 249 likes, 9 dislikes (British): *"Be alarmed! Be very alarmed! Look what has happened to Europe and the UK."*
- 210 likes, 5 dislikes (Australian): *"It's really happening then..."*
- 193 likes, 9 dislikes (Australian): *"Blame Labour and the greens for this mess."*
- 136 likes, 3 dislikes (Australian): *"big trouble..."*
- 135 likes, 7 dislikes (Australian): *"God help us."*
- 107 likes, 5 dislikes (Australian): *"Wow, there's something to really look forward to as the years tick by, knowing that the country is changing for ever."*
- 142 likes, 3 dislikes (Australian): *"And so it begins. Thank you, traitorous politicians and unhinged lefties."*
- 117 likes, 3 dislikes (Australian): *"Our politicians are nuts. I can't imagine what this country will be like in 20 years - in 10 years even. An immigration regime that is completely out of control."*
- 99 likes, 4 dislikes (Australian): *"This is all by design. Welcome to the Globalist agenda."*
- 108 likes, 6 dislikes: *"And strangely our welfare debit and crime have risen this much as well, interesting."*
- 105 likes, 5 dislikes (Australian): *"One only has to look and see how our Country has become - no statistics needed it is hardly headline news for those with eyes."*

- 90 likes, 3 dislikes (Australian): *"A very worrying statistic. No hope for future generations if this continues."*
- 83 likes, 3 dislikes (British): *"Talk about learning from other people's mistakes. Obviously a saying they've never heard of."*

Black Lives Matter: 35% support among whites, mainly women and children

Black Lives Matter was founded in 2013 to protest alleged abuse of black suspects by white police officers. It was bankrolled by the Soros and Ford foundations to the tune of $133 million, as part of a wider network of black resistance groups.

After a number of highly-publicized police incidents, Black Lives Matter caused major riots in Ferguson (2014) and Baltimore (2015), with riots and protests going nationwide in late May 2020 after police officer Derek Chauvin murdered black arrestee George Floyd. At that point just about every Hollywood actor, supermodel, popstar, and even many ordinary social media celebrities started supporting Black Lives Matter, if only out of sheer media and industry pressure. However, what do the statistics tell us?



It would have been even more interesting to see if white females made up over 60% of the most active group compared to white males.

Well, Harvard-Harris published a poll in August 2017, revealing that 35% of whites, 50% of Hispanics and 83% of blacks supported the movement. In addition, males of all ethnicities combined supported the movement to the tune of 40%, women 46%, and for the rest it was obvious that most of the support came from the youngest generation.

CL2 Do you have a favorable or unfavorable opinion of Black Lives Matter protests and protesters?

Fielding Period: July 19-24, 2017

	Total	Male	Female	18-34	35-49	50-64	65+	White	Hisp-anic	Black /AA
harvardharrispoll.com '17									ISGP-studies.com '20	
ted Base	2032	858	1174	443	577	550	462	1611	145	165
d Base	2051	980	1071	536	526	553	436	1335	278	237
Favorable	883 43%	395 40%	488 46%	330 61%	219 42%	209 38%	125 29%	466 35%	139 50%	197 83%
Unfavorable	1168 57%	586 60%	582 54%	206 39%	308 58%	343 62%	311 71%	868 65%	139 50%	41 17%

Looking at some of the white teenagers aiding the Black Lives Matter riots in 2020, it appears a lot of support comes from teens not even old

enough to vote or be taken up in most polls - which begs the question what role schools are playing in indoctrinating our kids.

Newsweek was among those newspapers who reported on the poll. Towards the end of the article it reads:

> *"More than 323 million people live in the U.S., and only 13 percent of them are black. Whites make up 76.9 percent of the population."*[18]

That's a fascinating statement, because in reality whites consisted of 61% at that point, and that is with 2% Jews included. What Newsweek, similar to many national crime databases, did here, was label the 16% U.S.-based Hispanic/Latino immigrants as "white". This is a very troublesome development, just by looking at genetic IQ and ethnic crime numbers alone. It's also additionally deceptive, because the Harvard-Harris poll it reported on, clearly separated whites from Hispanics.

The Hill also reported on the poll. It added:

> *"Seventy percent said black people committing crimes against other black people is a bigger problem in African-American communities than police violence toward blacks. African-Americans are split here, with 49 percent saying black crime is a bigger problem and 51 percent saying police violence toward blacks is the bigger problem.*
>
> *"62 percent said the focus on police behavior has handcuffed law enforcement officials by discouraging them from doing their jobs, although only 44 percent of blacks agreed."*[19]

What really to say? Readers can check ISGP's article on ethnic crime, and it should be more than clear black-on-black crime is the only problem, especially considering a 2015 study demonstrated that white police officers were the best for black suspects to deal with, as black police officers incorrectly shot black suspects twice as often, and Hispanic officers three times as often...

Most importantly here maybe is that it becomes perfectly clear again that there is a conspiracy at the top of our society controlling Silicon Valley, Hollywood and the media, who aid in pressuring celebrities into supporting Black Lives Matter, making it seem as if there is no dissent from this view. As the above polls shows though, the truth is very different.

One other thing is for sure: the Harvard-Harris poll panel at the very least has a liberal bias among its respondents. Below the reader can spot the answers to the question whether Silicon Valley has a liberal or a conservative bias. By now everybody should know that Silicon Valley

censors conservativism and is a major champion of liberal elite ideas. But what do the respondents vote?

Base: All Respondents		Base: All Respondents	
QuickQuery Fielding Period: August 17-22, 2017 HCAPS (Filtered on Registered Voters)			Total
Unweighted Base	2263	Unweighted Base	2263
Weighted Base	2271	Weighted Base	2271
Tech companies are biased in favor of people with conservative views	270 12%	Tech companies are biased in favor of people with liberal views	801 35%
Tech companies are biased against people with conservative views	969 43%	Tech companies are biased against people with liberal views	416 18%
Tech companies are fair to people with conservative views	1032 45%	Tech companies are fair to people with liberal views	1054 46%
Sigma	2271 100%	Sigma	2271 100%

It should be clear that a large number of Harvard-Harris poll panel voters are making excuses for Silicon Valley's liberal bias, in effect voting that it is "fair" for Silicon Valley to censor conservatives and similarly "fair" that it is strongly biased in favor of liberals.

As I've expressed before, my main worry with these registered poll members is that these panels get infiltrated by "liberal CIA"-funded activists who help skew the polls in favor of liberalism. What I see here only increases that worry. And it makes one think about the 35% of whites supporting Black Lives Matter in the Harvard-Harris poll. How many of them happen to be activists, or trolls, similar to the ones one sees all over the place on (Silicon Valley-created) social media platforms? Good question.

DIRTY TRICKS

List of dirty tricks in immigration polls

Doing a poll really isn't that hard. Once in a while you ask a large sample of every major ethnicity (native white, Eastern European immigrant white, black, Arab/Muslim, Latino, Indian, North-East Asian, and maybe Native Indian/Eskimo and Hawaiian) in a country what they think of immigration from every other region in the world. You do so with moderate, balanced questions and you make people feel like they have nothing to worry about in terms of being racist. Unfortunately, this type of poll - everything combined here - has NEVER been carried out in the West.

What we get for the most part is rather simplistic, isolated polls with often incompetent or manipulative questions being asked. Some of the major polling bureaus, Ipsos MORI in particular, but seemingly also Pew,

also include tons of dirty tricks to hide widespread Third World immigration opposition in the West. Here is a list of dirty tricks I've ran into over the course of putting together this article. Most have been employed by Ipsos MORI at one point or another.

1. Don't separate the results for native whites (who only constitute 61% in the U.S. anno 2018) and newly-arrived Third World immigrants as Muslims, blacks and Latinos in your polls - and seldom inform your readers of this except sometimes in vague language in the fine print attached to the poll.

   Don't even do or mention this when polling "white heritage"-related questions: *"31 percent of Americans polled strongly or somewhat agreed that "America must protect and preserve its White European heritage," [note: also WAY too loaded for most liberals to agree to] and 39 percent agreed that "white people are currently under attack in this country." [note: same, although well over 1 in 3 still is an incredible number for a "conspiracy theory".]"* [20] Hello Ipsos MORI and Huffington Post.

2. If possible, and through isolated questioning, use this tactic to make the case that "citizens" of a certain country are becoming "more open-minded" about aspects of immigration, not telling the readers that the increase in support is simply due to the (huge) increase in Third World foreigners now being regarded as "native citizens". [21]

3. Put forward extreme or vague positions that will lead to less people giving unfavorable answers. Examples are: *"Should we cut off ALL Muslim immigration?"* (why not *"the majority of"*, or pose it in another way), *"Are there too many immigrants?"* (Immigration from where? Western Europe? Or the Third World? They have quite a difference in crime numbers, IQ, and cultural standards), or *"Immigrants are stealing our jobs! Agree or disagree."* (not the main issue for most people, who care more about general behavior, including crime and cultural integration). Extreme and vague questions like these are the norm.

4. Remove anyone of 65 years and older from the poll without giving any explanation, knowing full well that senior citizens - who will still vote for many years - vote to a relatively high degree in opposition to Third World immigration. Also here only put a notice in the fine print of your poll.

5. Include 16 and 17-year-old children in the poll - who aren't allowed to vote and are still under the care of their parents and school teachers

- knowing full well these kids vote to a relatively high degree in favor of Third World immigration.

6. Add more minorities than demographically accurate, especially for low percentage minorities. Every little bit helps.

7. Add about 20% more liberals / Democrats than conservatives / Republicans to a poll. This can be done, because there are more registered Democrats than Republicans, but it remains a bit of an odd comparison, especially with the huge chunk of minorities among the Democrat Party. Separating by ethnicity is at least as important.

8. Don't include the "unobtrusive method" in your poll, despite the fact it has been shown to greatly increase the willingness of participants to give their true opinions on controversial subjects to immigration. In on case study with the method the percentage of largely white, educated liberals agreeing with the position *"Cutting off immigration to the United States"* went from 42% to 61%.

9. Continually remark that old and uneducated people oppose immigration to a greater extent without giving any nuances, making readers feel like they too must be old and uneducated for voting in favor of restricting immigration. The fact is that there's strong evidence that (liberal) college and university graduates feel a ton of pressure to support immigration. In addition, how about making additional categories for executives and business owners, especially in certain industries? Or by making more categories as 18-25 (students), 26-30 (a few older students, but mostly young working people with their brains fully developed and seriously lower crime levels than teens and persons in their early 20s), 31-40, etc., so you can get a much better handle on when and how individuals develop certain opinions.

10. Insinuate that white people away from the big cities are more bigoted and more *"fearful of what they don't know"*, this because they have higher opposition numbers against Third World immigration. Don't provide any nuances, such as the explanation that the differences generally are rather small, that a small number of whites in big cities feel pressured because of friends and potential partners they have, and that big business people often reside in major city centers (especially in case of the UK poll including the City of London). Don't discuss ANY of this.

11. Compare "bigoted" anti-immigration sentiment of large, relatively low immigration regions with (very) high-immigration cities -

without mentioning the immigration levels. A good portion of the Belgian media actually very sneakily did this in December 2017 [22] by comparing the whole Dutch-language north of the country - Flanders, with a 20% immigration level [23] - with the French-language city of Brussels, which had/has an unbelievable immigration percentage of 67%, the majority of them Islamic Moroccan. [24]

12. With every unfavorable poll, start discussing the evidence that people are overestimating the percentage of immigrants in the country, with that insinuating that poll participants are uninformed and overreacting (without giving plenty of alternative explanations). As so many other tactics listed here, IPSOS in particular has developed a habit of doing this in polls from The Netherlands to the United States. [25]

13. With every unfavorable poll, include the same questions but then related to "the own environment", followed by insinuations that poll participants are uninformed and overreacting along the lines as: *"Look, it's not so bad in your own environment - the only place you can see with your own two eyes - and you are overestimating the number of immigrants in the country, so you really are uninformed and overreacting"*. Ignore obvious explanations that white people flee and stay away from immigration centers and that most have some experience with them.

14. Turn facts into bigoted-sounding "opinions", such as Ipsos did in a February 2018 report commissioned by elite foundation-funded "liberal CIA" outlet NPR: *"Nearly one-third of Republicans (31%) believe that immigrants are more likely to commit crimes or be incarcerated compared to U.S.-born citizens [note: Third World immigrants, also second generation; as usual, Ipsos is extremely vague], compared to just 12% of Democrats and 13% of Independents."*[26]

15. Suggest that polling results might just be *"a fad"*, because of a *"populist"* candidate *"hyping up"* people, or because of native whites *"looking for victims"* due to an economic slump.

16. Hide unfavorable polling results until after the elections. [27]

Another questionable Ipsos MORI poll

Throughout this article, questions about Ipsos MORI's polling methods have been piling up. Over the years this polling bureau has employed most of the dirty tricks described above. One interesting development

has been that since its 2011 poll on immigration opinion, subsequent annual polls consistently revealed much lower numbers in most countries. Some of the declines are really extreme:


IPSOS IMMIGRATION AND REFUGEES POLL
Half believe "there are too many immigrants in our country"
Jul 2017 - Strongly Agree/Tend to Agree
Demoskop 2010-15 study
Total 48%
Italy 66% -1%
Belgium -11% 61% 67% (Le Soir '17)/ 64% (RIIA '17)
France +1% 53% 65% (Le Monde '17) / 61% (RIIA '17)
Germany 50% -3%
Sweden 48% +2%
United States 48% -11%
Spain 47% -20% (-30% relative / -40%)
Great Britain 45% -26% (-37% relative)
July 2016 Oct 2015 July 2015 2014 2013 2011
49% 46% 50% 48% 51% 52%
65% 61% 71% 67% 65% 67%
60% 60% 61% 63% 70% 72%
57% 51% 60% 58% 57% 70% 52%
50% 48% 43% 51% 47% 53%
43% 41% 43% 58% 37% 53% 33% 50% 46% 47%
51% 47% 49% 48% 53% 59%
40% -27% 44% 48% 48% 56% 67%
49% 53% 60% 60% 80% 64% 71%
whites

How about:

- Spain collapsing 27 percent points between 2011 and 2016, from 67% to just 40%?
- Great Britain dropping 26 percent points between 2011 and 2017, from 71% to just 45%?
- 79.7% of UK whites in favor of reducing immigration in 2014 versus maybe 53-54% (based on the 45% number for all ethnicities) by 2017?
- immigration opposition dramatically dropping in Sweden from 2011 on, according to Ipsos, with a more extensive Swedish poll showing a rapid immigration opposition increase over this same period, to the point Ipsos is polling 15 to 17 percent points lower than this Swedish study from 2013 to 2015? (33% vs 50%, 37% vs 53%, 43% vs 58%)
- the United States dropping up to 12 percent points after its 2011 high of 59%, to just 47-48%?

In April 2018, when I first asked these questions to Ipsos MORI managing director and head of research, Bobby Duffy, I had picked up on the inclusion of all ethnicities - a common practice with almost all polls - but had not yet realized that Ipsos MORI employed tricks as removing 64+ citizens and included 16 and 17-year-old children for non-U.S. countries. These tactics explain a LOT in terms of why Ipsos MORI has consistently been polling so low in most countries. But they don't explain the additional decreases in anti-immigration sentiment, because the same tactics were also employed in 2011. Duffy's answers as to how these declines occurred come down to expressing ignorance and making excuses:

> *"Unfortunately it's an extremely busy time for us, so the team and I don't have time to answer your points in detail – it's a major task to review other polls for consistency with ours/identify the causes of difference - but there are a couple of general responses that I hope help."*

The "too busy" comment is a bit of an impolite, passive aggressive response, because it indicates that my questions aren't important or relevant enough for Duffy and his team of "professionals" to be answered.

> *"Some of the differences you highlight are not actually that large in survey research terms, once you account for the margin of error on the studies – eg your Belgium example. I would not see those as massively inconsistent"*

In my list of questions to him, I never asked Duffy about Belgium, because the decline in immigration opposition here, while present, is not too extreme. Thus, instead, I asked Duffy about France, Sweden, Spain and Great Britain. So why bring up Belgium at all? Besides that, I think 72% versus 61% might not be *"massively inconsistent"*, but it's certainly a major and in this case quite consistent decline that needs explanation.

> *"At least one of the studies you quote is a mixed methods survey, including telephone, whereas our polls are online (and also usually only cover the population to aged 65, as outlined in the tech notes)."*

Only after reading this remark did I notice the 64+ population was not included in Ipsos MORI's polls. The rest of this answer is an excuse: whether you conduct a poll via telephone or online shouldn't matter much in the end result. Not if you have selected a proper sample size.

> *"In another example [Sweden] you're comparing a question that uses a seven point scale with our one on four point scale with different terms used: this will impact on results. ... Do note too that our latest study in Sweden shows a big shift away from positive views of immigration there."*

This also doesn't matter as you can compare "oppose a lot" and "oppose a little" in one poll to "oppose" in another poll. This shouldn't result in 53% opposition in the first poll and 37% in the second one. Also the comment about a *"big shift away"* from immigration support in 2017 in Sweden is a cop out, because I was asking about the differences for 2013-2015. If Ipsos measured 48% in 2017, then how high would the number have been if the Demoskop study had been continued beyond 2015? Up to 65% would be a possibility based on the previous differences.

> *"The fundamental question about how do we account for the positive shift in attitudes to immigration in Britain etc is a very good one – and I don't think anyone has a firm answer. It has been seen in just about all decent survey series – it is not just us.*
>
> *"I have two hypotheses: the people are reassured that immigration will reduce, and therefore are more willing to concede that immigration has positive aspects/don't feel the need to call for it to be reduced further (bear in mind we're already seeing a drop in numbers, although the survey trend started before that was the case), or that people are more galvanised to say actually I don't mind immigration so much,*

> *through regret about the Brexit vote (bearing in mind half the population voted to remain)."*

So Duffy doesn't have a clue as to the key question I asked about Britain (and other countries): the reasons behind the sudden decline in immigration opposition his polls show? I'm not sure what *"decent surveys"* he means, but I assume ones carried out by establishment interests. Also, I don't need to *"bear in mind"* that his first hypothesis holds little water because the collapse in immigration opposition was fully set in well before the 2016 Brexit vote, and to this day there actually isn't any *"reassurance"* that immigration levels will drop. The poll's question *"there are too many immigrants in our country"* also doesn't directly deal with immigration numbers, but with (Third World) immigrants already in the country.

His second hypothesis of Britons being so distraught with the potential economic consequences of Brexit that they all of a sudden start voting in favor of immigration also is a little questionable. First of all, it's more likely that Britons would vote *for* Brexit while still voting *against* additional immigration - even though the two can hardly coexist due to establishment manipulation. Duffy's idea, as one can only expect from a Guardian newspaper contributor, that the masses are fully starting to submit to the globalist agenda over extreme Brexit fear-mongering sounds more like wishful thinking than a sound hypothesis. What Duffy instead needs to do is explain why the collapse in support already started in 2013 and 2014, with only the separate 2014 poll on whites being in line with the higher 2011 number. My main question has always been why the 2011 is so much higher than subsequent ones, while countless other international polls reveal that the 2011 numbers were the most accurate. Of course, Duffy already explained that Ipsos MORI doesn't pay attention to other survey, except for *"the decent ones"* of course:

> *"I don't have time to answer your points in detail [and] it's a major task to review other polls for consistency with ours/identify the causes of difference."*

Call me crazy, but the way that I look at it is that by comparing the results of one poll with other roughly similar ones, provides poll takers with a sense accountability. They can't just deliver whatever numbers they feel like. Their numbers need to be roughly in-line with others polls. This does not appear the case comparing Ipsos' results with many international polls. In addition, comparing these results only took a day or 2 - and that was me still fully immersed in a steep learning curve on various poll tactics and not knowing what numbers to expect in other polls. One (semi-)dedicated Ipsos MORI employee could easily write an appendix for a report where he compares the acquired results with those of a number of other studies. With a little experience, he or she can easily do so within a few days.

In short, too many questions remain about the extreme decline in immigration opposition in a variety of countries shown by post-2011 Ipsos MORI polls for them to have been included in the above discussions. On top of that, if Ipsos MORI wants to be taken seriously, it should begin by polling the entire population of 18 and older instead of cutting out all senior citizens of 65 and older while at the same time including 16 and 17-year-old children. That having been said, even with the most recent Ipsos MORI polls, it is clear that immigration opposition stands at well above 50% among the white populations of western countries. If referendums on this issue were held, the borders to the Third World would be closed in no time. And maybe that is why this issue is not resolved by referendum...

Questionable Pew polls - elite-controlled as well

Now, two "authoritative" polls have been excluded from this list, because I suspect outright fraud. The first is the 2007 Pew Global Survey on immigration support. It's incredibly inconsistent. On the one hand, it displays huge (but recognizable) numbers for the statement *"We Should Further Restrict and Control Immigration"*. 75% of the U.S. agrees. As for Europe, the numbers were: Italy: 87%, Spain: 77%, Great Britain: 75%, France: 68%, Germany: 66% and Sweden: 53%.

If I wanted to, I could just use this number to increase the above average for immigration opposition. This would be inappropriate, however, because when you look at another section of the Pew poll, where the following position is put forward: *"Immigration from the Middle East and N. Africa is a ... Good thing [or] Bad Thing"*, all of sudden we see the following support (*"good thing"*) numbers for Europe: France: 58% (2006; up from 44% in 2002), Great Britain: 61% (2005; up from 53% in 2002), Spain: 67% (2005), Germany: 34% (consistently), and Italy: 20%.

Pew Global Attitudes Project
International Advisory Board

Madeleine K. Albright, Chair
The Albright Group LLC, Washington, DC, USA

Lloyd Axworthy, Director and CEO, Liu Center for the Study of Global Issues, University of British Columbia, Mill Bay, Canada

Stephen M. Case, Chairman of the Board, AOL Time Warner, Inc., Washington, DC, USA

Hernando De Soto, President, Institute for Liberty and Democracy, Lima, Peru

Gareth Evans, President, International Crisis Group, Brussels, Belgium — Soros

Leslie H. Gelb, President, Council on Foreign Relations, Washington, DC, USA

Peter C. Goldmark, Chairman and CEO, International Herald Tribune, Paris, France

David Hannay, Former UK Permanent Representative to the United Nations, London, England

Carla A. Hills, Chairman and CEO, Hills & Company, Washington, DC, USA

Henry Kissinger, Chairman, Kissinger Associates, Inc., New York, NY, USA

Yotaro Kobayashi, Chairman, Fuji-Xerox, Tokyo, Japan

Tommy Koh, Director, The Institute of Policy Studies, Singapore

Philippe Lampreia, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

Jessica Tuchman Mathews, President, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Washington, DC, USA

Don McHenry, School of Foreign Service, Georgetown University, Washington, DC, USA

Queen Noor of Jordan

John Passacantando, Executive Director, Greenpeace USA, Washington, DC, USA

Peter G. Peterson, Chairman, The Blackstone Group, New York, NY

Moeen Qureshi, Chairman, Emerging Markets Partnership, Washington, DC, USA

Kenneth Roth, Executive Director, Human Rights Wat New York, NY, USA

Jenny Shipley, Member of Parliament, Rakaia, New Zealand

Peter D. Sutherland, Chairman and Managing Director Goldman Sachs International, Dublin, Ireland

John J. Sweeney, President, AFL-CIO, Washington, D USA

Desmond M. Tutu, Anglican Archbishop Emeritus, Ca Town, South Africa

Laura D'Andrea Tyson, Dean, London Business Scho London, England

B. Joseph White, Interim President, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, USA

Tadashi Yamamoto, President, Japan Center for International Exchange, New York, NY, USA

Charles Zhang, Director and CEO, Sohu.com, Beijing, China

Institutional affiliations for identification purposes only

The Pew Global Attitudes Project

WHAT THE WORLD THINKS IN 2002

Update: This article was written in 2018. I had no clue until May 2020 that Madeleine Albright, Henry Kissinger, David Rockefeller friend Peter Peterson and Soros-ally Gareth Evans were overseeing the publication of Pew polls.

How do these numbers fit with anything we've seen with other polls discussed in this article? They don't. If roughly 60% of "Americans" polled by Pew had "positive views" of Asian and Latino immigration, then why is 75% in favor of restricting it? It's possible to come up with excuses, but it would have been nice if Pew spent some time explaining this aspect, because it strongly indicates that there are widespread worries about U.S. immigration policy - as we've clearly seen in other polls.

In addition, by 2016-2017 at least 60% of European whites (as well as roughly similar numbers of American whites it appears) were vocally opposed to ANY additional Muslim immigration, with only an average of 15% vocal opposition among this ethnic group to this rather hardline position. Three French polls discussed here from the 2013-2017 period show an average vocal white opposition of roughly 74% to primarily Muslim immigration, with roughly 91% not disagreeing with such notions. And here Pew is polling a 58% approval rating among the French of Muslim and African immigration? Even if you take out the share of these immigrants (roughly 7%) from this poll, you're still at a

51% approval rating - which enigmatically is opposed by a 70%+ desire among French whites to restrict immigration. It just makes no sense. I already made it very clear to have never heard a positive word about Arab and black African immigration into the Netherlands and the situation in France is (even) worse than it is here. Then there are these convenient twilight zone conclusions of the Pew poll researchers:

> *"Solid majorities of Americans and Canadians say it is a good thing that Asians, Mexicans, and Latin Americans come to live and work in their countries, and majorities in Britain and France express this opinion about Middle Eastern, North African, and Eastern European immigrants. ...*
>
> *"Americans [around 2005 15% of U.S. was of hispanic origin] and Canadians continue to be generally more welcoming to newcomers than Europeans. As in 2005, solid majorities in both countries say it is a good thing that people from Asia and from Mexico and Latin America come to live and work in their countries. About six-in-ten Americans express positive views about Asian (61%) and Latin American (57%) immigrants. Canadians are even more welcoming – about seven-in-ten say immigration from Asia (71%) and from Latin America (72%) is a good thing."*[28]

So... Europeans in particular are *"not welcoming"* to *"newcomers"*... That's an interesting way of putting the Arab and black African invasion of Europe and the huge increases in crime and the cultural devastation they have brought. Pew is spreading clear-cut propaganda here. I don't know who they polled or how they delivered their questions, but something is off with this poll.

Update: See the above elites coincidentally controlling the publication of these polls.

Notes

1. February 7, 2017, chathamhouse.org, 'What Do Europeans Think About Muslim Immigration?'. chathamhouse.org/expert/comment/what-do-europeans-think-about-muslim-immigration
2. August 4, 2011, ipsos.com, 'Too Many Immigrants?'.
3. January 9, 2017, rtbf.be, 'Noir Jaune Blues: constat d'echec pour le vivre-ensemble en Belgique'.
4. January 25, 2013, thelocal.fr, ''Too many foreigners in France', French say'.
5. March 7, 2017, Le Monde, 'L'immigration et l'islam demeurent des sujets clivants en France'.

6. November 14, 2014, Nu.nl (premier Dutch news aggregate site), 'Meerderheid vindt aantal allochtonen in Nederland 'te hoog'.
7. February 8, 2020, NPO 1: Wakker Nederland (WNL) (Dutch public TV), '91% ziet geen kans voor meer inwoners: 'Immigratie moet beperkt worden''.
wnl.tv/2020/02/08/geen-mogelijkheden-meer-inwoners-nederland/.
8. March 8, 2021, Daniel van Dam for De Telegraaf, 'Rel rond immigratierapport: emeritus-hoogleraar op strafbankje': *"The University of Amsterdam is angry at four researchers who published a report last week about the enormously high costs of immigration."* There are plenty of other examples regarding Van Dam.
9. Jan. 17, 2026, Hart van Nederland, 'Nederlanders geven brede steun aan 'remigratie', helft blijft voor asielstop'.
hartvannederland.nl/het-beste-van-hart/panel/artikelen/asiel-migratie-remigratie-onderzoek-dublinverdrag (accessed: Jan. 21, 2026).
10. youtube.com/watch?v=RGhrb2c817k (accessed: June 24, 2018).
11. July 2, 2016, Breitbart, 'Poll: Huge Majority Wants Immigration Ban on Sharia Supporters'.
12. *) December 2010, Alexander Janus of UCLA Berkerly in Social Science Quarterly, pp. 928-946, 'The Influence of Social Desirability Pressures on Expressed Immigration Attitudes' (poll conducted from October 2005 through February 2006, based on 700 non-hispanic whites, devided in two groups.
onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/j.1540-6237.2010.00742.x (full PDF not available).
*) August 1, 2017, Breitbart, 'Surveys Show 60 Percent Opposition to all Immigration'.
13. March 20, 2017, news.gallup.com, 'In U.S., Worry About Illegal Immigration Steady'.
14. September 15, 2017, Huffington Post, 'Most Americans Oppose White Supremacists, But Many Share Their Views: Poll'.
15. June 27, 2017, Daily Mail, 'Muslim population in Australia soars to 600,000 as religion becomes the nation's second-biggest - a 77% jump in the past DECADE, according to Census'.
16. September 21, 2016 - Huffington Post, 'Half Of Australia Would Ban Muslim Migration. Here's Why That's Shocking; Pauline Hanson's views are almost the majority.'
17. October 26, 2017, SBS News (Australia), 'Australians support partial ban on Muslim immigration: survey'.
18. August 3, 2017, Newsweek, 'Majority of Americans Have 'Unfavorable View' of Black Lives Matter, Say Black Crime Is a Top Concern'.
19. August 2, 2017, The Hill, 'Poll: 57 percent have negative view of Black Lives Matter movement'.

20. September 15, 2017, Huffington Post, 'Most Americans Oppose White Supremacists, But Many Share Their Views: Poll'.
21. December 18, 2017, HLN, 'Studie: Belgen in 2016 positiever tegenover vluchtelingen en migratie dan in 2002' ('Study: Belgians in 2016 more positive towards refugess and migration than in 2002').
22. Ibid.
23. January 27, 2014, De Standaard (major Belgian newspaper), 'One Flemish in six is of foreign heritage' ('Een Vlaming op zes is van vreemde herkomst'): *"With kids up to 5-years-old it is even about one [foreign] Flemish in three."*
24. lavigerie.be/spip.php?article594 (accessed: June 27, 2018): *"Iets meer dan 20% van de Belgen heeft allochtone roots. ... Vooral de steden scoren hoog: in Brussel 67%, in Luik 47%, in Charleroi 41%, in Antwerpen 40 %, in Gent 25 %. ... In Sint-Joost-Ten-Node is dat 96 % van de bevolking, in Sint-Gillis 91 %, in Elsene 86 %."*
25. ipsos.com/sites/default/files/ct/news/documents/2018-02/npr_immigration_topline_2.5.18.pdf (accessed: June 25, 2018).
26. Ibid.
27. November 18, 2016, Breitbart, 'Hidden Ipsos Poll: Public Strongly Backs Donald Trump's Plan To 'Pause' Legal Immigration'.
28. pewglobal.org/2007/10/04/chapter-2-views-of-immigration/ (accessed: June 26, 2018).